National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XXVI. NO. 36. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 13, 1866. WHOLE NO. 1,336.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT $3.00 PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, No. 48 Beekman Street, New York

LETTERS should be addressed to *Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard*, 48 Beekman st., New York.

ADVERTISEMENTS, 10 cents per line each insertion.

ROBERT J. JOHNSTON, PRINTER,
No. 33 BEEKMAN STREET, N. Y.

Selections.

REORGANIZATION.

VALEDICTORY ADDRESS OF GOV. JOHN A. ANDREW, OF MASSACHUSETTS, JAN. 4, 1866.

Gentlemen of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

THE people of Massachusetts have vindicated alike their intelligence, their patriotism, their will, and their power, both in the cultivation of the arts of Peace and in the prosecution of just and unavoidable War. At the end of five years of Executive administration, I appear before a Convention of the two Houses of her General Court in the execution of a final duty.

For nearly all that period, the Commonwealth, as a loyal State of the American Union, has been occupied, within her sphere of co-operation, in helping to maintain by arms the power of the nation, the liberties of the people, and the rights of human nature.

Having contributed to the Army and the Navy—including regulars, volunteers, seamen and marines, men of all arms and officers of all grades, and of the various terms of service—an aggregate of one hundred and fifty-nine thousand one hundred and sixty-five men; and having expended for the war, out of her own Treasury, twenty-seven million seven hundred and five thousand one hundred and nine dollars—besides the expenditures of her cities and towns, she has maintained, by the unfailing energy and economy of her sons and daughters, her industry and thrift, even in the waste of war. She has paid promptly, and *in gold*, all interest on her bonds—including the old and the new—guarding her faith and honor with every public creditor, while still fighting the public enemy; and now, at last, in retiring from her service, I confess the satisfaction of having first seen all of her regiments and batteries (save two battalions) returned and mustered out of the Army; and of leaving her treasury provided for, by the fortunate and profitable negotiation of all the permanent loan needed or foreseen—with her financial credit maintained at home and abroad, her public securities unsurpassed, if even equalled, in value in the money market of the world by those of any State or of the Nation.

I have already had the honor to lay before the General Court, by special message to the Senate, a statement of all affairs which demand my own official communication. And it only remains for me to transfer, at the appropriate moment, the cares, the honors, and the responsibilities of office to the hands of that eminent and patriotic citizen, on whose public experience and ability the Commonwealth so justly relies.

But perhaps before descending for the last time from this venerable seat, I may be indulged in some allusion to the broad field of thought and statesmanship, to which the war itself has conducted us. As I leave the Temple where, humbled by my unworthiness, I have stood so long like a priest of Israel sprinkling the blood of the holy sacrifice on the altar—I would fain contemplate the solemn and manly duties which remain to us who survive the slain, in honor of their memory and in obedience to God.

The Nation having been ousted by armed Rebellion of its just possession, and the exercise of its Constitutional jurisdiction over the territory of the Rebel States, has now, at last, by the suppression of the Rebellion (accomplished by the victories of the national arms over those of the rebels), regained possession and restored its own rightful sway.

The rebels had overthrown the loyal State governments. They had made war against the Union. The government of each rebel State had not only withdrawn its allegiance, but had given in its adhesion to *another*, viz: *The Confederate Government*—a government not only injurious by its very creation, but hostile to, and in arms against the Union, asserting and exercising belligerent rights, both on land and sea, and seeking alliances with foreign nations, even demanding the armed intervention of neutral powers.

The pretensions of this "Confederacy" were maintained for some four years, in one of the most extensive, persistent, and bloody wars of History. To overcome it, and maintain the rights and the very existence of the Union, our National Government was compelled to keep on foot one of the most stupendous military establishments the world has ever known. And probably the same amount of force, naval and military, was never organized and involved in any national controversy.

On both sides there was *war*, with all its incidents, all its claims, its rights, and its results.

The States in rebellion tried, under the lead of their new Confederacy, to conquer the Union; but in the attempt they were themselves conquered.

They did not revert by their rebellion, nor by our conquest, into "Territories." They did not commit suicide. But they rebelled, they went to war; and they were *conquered*.

A "territory" of the United States is a possession or dependency of the United States, having none of the distinctive Constitutional attributes of a State. A territory might be in rebellion; but not thereby cease to be a territory. It would be properly described as *a territory in rebellion*. Neither does a State in rebellion cease to be a State. It would be correctly described as *a State in rebellion*; and it would be subject to the proper consequences of rebellion, both direct and incidental—among which may be that of military government or supervision, by the nation, determinable only by the nation, at its own just discretion, in the due exercise of the rights of war. The power to put an end to its life is not an attribute of a State of our Union. Nor can the Union put an end to its own life, save by an alteration of the National Constitution, or by suffering such defeat in war as to bring it under the jurisdiction of a conqueror. The nation has a vested interest in the life of the individual State. The States have a vested interest in the life of the Union. I do not perceive, therefore, how a State has the power, by its own action alone, without the co-operation of the Union, to destroy the continuity of its corporate life. Nor do I perceive how the National Union can by its own action, without the action or omission of the States, destroy the continuity of its own corporate life. It seems to me that the stream of life flows through both State and Nation from a double source; which is a distinguishing element of its vital power. Eccentricity of motion is not death; nor is abnormal action organic change.

The position of the rebel States is fixed by the Constitution, and by the laws, or rights, of war. If they had conquered the Union, they might have become independent; whatever else it might have been stipulated they should become, by the terms of an ultimate treaty of peace. But, being conquered, they failed in accomplishing anything but their own conquest. They were still States—though belligerents conquered. But they had lost their loyal organizations as States, lost their present possession of their political and representative power in the Union. Under the Constitution they have no means nor power of their own to regain it. But the exigency is provided for by that clause in the Federal Constitution in which the Federal Government guarantees a republican form of government to every State. The regular and formal method would be, therefore, for the National Government to provide specifically for their reorganization.

The right and duty, however, of the General Government under the circumstances of their present case, is not the single one of reorganizing these disorganized States. The war imposed rights and duties, peculiar to itself and to the relations and the results of war. The first duty of the Nation is to regain its own *power*. It has already made a great advance in the direction of its power.

If ours were a despotic government, it might even now be thought that it had already accomplished the re-establishment of its power as a government. But, ours being a republican and a popular government, it cannot be affirmed that the proper power of the government is restored until a peaceful, loyal, and faithful state of mind gains a sufficient ascendency in the rebel and belligerent States to enable the Union and loyal citizens everywhere to repose alike on the purpose and ability of their people, in point of numbers and capacity, to assert, maintain, and conduct State governments, republican in form, loyal in sentiment and character, with safety to themselves and to the national whole. If the people, or too large a portion of the people, of a given rebel State, are not willing and able to do this, then the condition of belligerency still exists, or, at least, a condition consequent upon and incidental thereto exists, which only the exercise on our part of belligerent rights, or some of their incidents, can meet or can cure. The rights of war must continue until the objects of the war have been accomplished, and the nation recognizes the return of a state of peace. It is absolutely necessary then for the Union Government to prescribe some reasonable test of loyalty to the people of the States in rebellion. It is necessary to require of them conformity to those arrangements which the war has rendered, or proved to be, necessary to the public peace and necessary as securities for the future. As the conquering party, the National Government has the right to govern these belligerent States meanwhile, at its own wise and conscientious discretion, subject: 1st. To the demands of natural justice, humanity, and the usages of civilized nations. 2d. To its duty under the Constitution, to guarantee republican governments to the States.

But there is no arbiter, save the people of the United States, between the Government of the Union and those States. Therefore, the precise things to be done, the precise way to do them, the precise steps to be taken, their order, progress, and direction, are all within the discretion of the National Government, in the exercise both of its belligerent and its more strictly Constitutional functions—exercising them according to its own wise, prudent, and just discretion. Its duty is not only to restore those States, but also to make sure of a lasting peace, of its own ultimate safety and the permanent establishment of the rights of all its subjects. To this end I venture the opinion that the Government of the United States ought to require the people of those States to reform their constitutions:

1. Guaranteeing to the people of color, now the wards of the Nation, their civil rights as men and women, on an equality with the white population, by amendments irrepealable in terms.

2. Regulating the elective franchise according to certain laws of universal application, and not by rules merely arbitrary, capricious, and personal.

3. Annulling the ordinances of secession.

4. Disaffirming the Rebel Debt, and

5. To ratify the anti-slavery amendment of the United States Constitution by their legislatures.

And I would have all these questions, save the fifth—the disposition of which is regulated by the Federal Constitution—put to the vote of the *People* themselves. We should neither be satisfied with the action of the conventions which have been held nor with what is termed the "loyal vote." We want the *popular* vote. And the rebel vote is better than the loyal vote, if on the right side. If it is not on the right side, then I fear those States are incapable at present of reorganization; the proper power of the Union Government is not restored; the people of those States are not yet prepared to assume their original functions with safety to the Union; and the state of war still exists, for they are contumacious and disobedient to the just demands of the Union, disowning the just conditions precedent to reorganization.

We are desirous of their reorganization, and to end the use of the war power. But I am confident we cannot reorganize political society with any proper security: 1. Unless we let in the *people* to a co-operation, and not merely an arbitrarily selected portion of them. 2. Unless we give those who are, by their intelligence and character, the natural leaders of the people, and who surely will lead them by and by, an opportunity to lead them now.

I am aware that it has been a favorite dogma in many quarters, "*No Rebel Voters.*" But—it is impossible in certain States to have *any* voting by white men, if only "loyal men"—*i. e.*, those who continued so during the rebellion, are permitted to vote. This proposition is so clear that the President adopted the expedient of assuming that those who had not risen above certain civil or military grades in the Rebel public service, and who had neither inherited nor earned more than a certain amount of property, should be deemed and taken to be sufficiently harmless to be intrusted with the suffrage in the work of reorganization. Although there is some reason for assuming that the less conspicuous and less wealthy classes of men had less to do than their more towering neighbors in conducting the States into the rebellion and through it—still I do not imagine that either wealth or conspicuous position, which are only the accidents of men, or at most, only external incidents, affect the substance of their characters. I think the poorer and less significant men who voted, or fought, for "Southern Independence," had quite as little love for "the Yankees," quite as much prejudice against "the Abolitionists," quite as much contempt for the colored men, and quite as much disloyalty at heart, as their more powerful neighbors.

The true question is, now, not of past disloyalty, but of present loyal purpose. We need not try to disguise the fact that we have passed through a *great popular revolution*. Everybody in the Rebel States was disloyal, with exceptions too few and too far between to comprise a loyal force, sufficient to constitute the State, even now that the armies of the Rebellion are overthrown. Do not let us deceive ourselves. The truth is, the public opinion of the white race in the South was in favor of the rebellion. The colored people sympathized with the Union cause. To the extent of their intelligence, they understood that the success of the South meant their continued slavery; that an easy success of the North meant leaving slavery just where we found it; that the *War* meant—if it lasted long enough—their emancipation. The whites went to war and supported the war, because they hoped to succeed in it, since they wanted, or thought they wanted, separation from the Union or "Southern Independence." There were, then, three great interests—there were the Southern whites, who as a body wished for what they called "Southern Independence;" the Southern blacks, who desired emancipation; the people of the "loyal States" who desired to maintain the Constitutional rights and the territorial integrity of the Nation. Some of us in the North had a strong hope, which by the favor of God has not been disappointed, out of our defence of the Union to accomplish the deliverance of our fellow men in bondage. But the "*loyal*" *idea* included emancipation, not for its own sake, but for the sake of the Union—if the Union could be saved, or served, by it. There were many men in the South—besides those known as loyal—who did not like to incur the responsibility of war against the Union; or who did not think the opportune moment had arrived to fight "the North;" or in whose hearts there was "a divided allegiance." But they were not the positive men. They were, with very few exceptions, not the leading minds, the courageous men, the impressive and powerful characters—they were not the young and active men. And when the decisive hour came, they went to the wall. No matter what they thought or how they felt about it; they could not stand or they would not stand—certainly they did not stand, against the storm. The revolution either converted them, or swept them off their feet. Their own sons volunteered. They became involved in all the work and in all the consequences of the war. The Southern people—as a People—fought, toiled, endured, and persevered, with a courage, a unanimity, and a persistency, not outdone by any people in any Revolution. There was never an acre of territory abandoned to the Union while it could be held by arms. There was never a rebel regiment surrendered to the Union arms until resistance was overcome by force; or a surrender was compelled by the stress of battle, or of military strategy. The people of the South, men and women, soldiers and civilians, volunteers and conscripts, in the army and at home, followed the fortunes of the rebellion and obeyed its leaders, so long as it had any fortunes or any leaders. Their young men marched up to the cannon's mouth a thousand times, where they were mowed down like grain by the reapers when the harvest is ripe. Some men had the faculty and the faith in the rebel cause to become its leaders. The others had the faculty and the faith to follow them.

All honor to the loyal few! But I do not regard the distinction between loyal and disloyal persons of the white race, residing in the South during the rebellion, as being, for present purposes, a practical distinction. It is even doubtful whether the comparatively loyal few (with certain prominent and honorable exceptions) can be well discriminated from the disloyal mass. And since the President finds himself obliged to let in the great mass of the disloyal by the very terms of his proclamation of amnesty, to a participation in the business of reorganizing the Rebel States, I am obliged also to confess that I think the making of one rule for the richer and higher rebels, and another rule for the poorer and more lowly rebels is impolitic and unphilosophical. I find evidence, in the granting of pardons, that such also is the opinion of the President.

When the day arrives, which must surely come, when an amnesty, substantially universal, shall be proclaimed, the leading minds of the South, who by temporary policy and artificial rules had been for the while disfranchised, will resume their influence and their sway. The capacity of leadership is a gift, not a device. They whose courage, talents, and will, entitle them to lead, will lead. And these men—not then estopped by their own consent or participation in the business of reorganization—may not be slow to question the validity of great public transactions enacted during their own disfranchisement. If it is asked, in reply, "What can they do?" and "What can come of their discontent?" I answer, that while I do not know just what they can do nor what may come of it, neither do I know what they may not attempt, nor what they may not accomplish. I only know that we ought to demand, and to secure, the co-operation of the strongest and ablest minds and the natural leaders of opinion in the South. If we cannot gain their support of the just measures needful for the work of safe reorganization, reorganization will be delusive and full of danger.

Why not try them? They are the most hopeful subjects to deal with, in the very nature of the case. They have the brain and the experience and the education to enable them to understand the exigences of the present situation. They have the courage, as well as the skill, to lead the people in the direction their judgments point, in spite of their own and the popular prejudice. Weaker men, those of less experience, who have less hold on the public confidence, are comparatively powerless. Is it consistent with reason and our knowledge of human nature, to believe the masses of Southern men able to face about, to turn their backs on those they have trusted and followed, and to adopt the lead of those who have no magnetic hold on their hearts or minds? Reorganization in the South demands the aid of men of great moral courage, who can renounce their own past opinions, and do it boldly; who can comprehend what the work is, and what are the logical consequences of the new situation; men who have interests urging them to rise to the height of the occasion. They are not the strong men from whom weak, vacillating counsels come; nor are they the great men from whom come counsels born of prejudices and follies, having their root in an institution they know to be dead, and buried beyond the hope of resurrection.

Has it never occurred to us all, that we are now proposing the most wonderful and unprecedented of human transactions? The conquering government, at the close of a great war, is about restoring to the conquered rebels not only their local governments in the States, but their representative share in the general government of the country! They are, in their States, to govern themselves as they did before the rebellion. The conquered rebels are, in the Union, to help govern and control the conquering loyalists!! These being the privileges which they are to enjoy when reorganization becomes complete, I declare that I know not any safeguard, precaution, or act of prudence, which wise statesmanship might not recognize to be reasonable and just. If we have no right to demand guarantees for the future; if we have no right to insist upon significant acts of loyal submission from the rebel leaders themselves; if we have no right to demand the positive, popular vote in favor of the guarantees we need; if we may not stipulate for the recognition of the just rights of the slaves, whom, in the act of suppressing the rebellion, we converted from slaves into freemen, then I declare that we had no right to emancipate the slaves, nor to suppress the rebellion.

I may be asked: Why not demand the suffrage for colored men in season for their vote in the business of reorganization? My answer is—I assume that the colored men are in favor of those measures which the Union needs to have adopted. But it would be idle to reorganize those States by the colored vote. If the popular vote of the white race is not to be had in favor of the guarantees justly required, then I am in favor of holding on—just where we now are. I am not in favor of a surrender of the present rights of the Union to a struggle between a white minority aided by the freedmen on the one hand, against a majority of the white race on the other. I would not consent, having rescued those States by arms from secession and rebellion, to turn them over to anarchy and chaos. I have, however, no doubt—none whatever—of our *right* to stipulate for colored suffrage. The question is one of statesmanship, not a question of constitutional limitation.

If it is urged that the suffrage question is one peculiarly for the States, I reply: so also that of the abolition of slavery ordinarily would have been. But we are not now deciding what a loyal State, acting in its Constitutional sphere, and in its normal relations to the Union, may do; but what a rebel, belligerent, conquered State must do, in order to be reorganized, and to get back into those relations. And in deciding this, I must repeat that we are to be governed only by Justice, Humanity, the Public Safety, and our duty to re-organize those conquered belligerent States, as we can and when we can, consistently therewith.

In dealing with those States, with a view of fulfilling the national guarantee of a republican form of government, it is plain, since the nation is called upon to reorganize government, where no loyal republican State government is in existence, that it must, of absolute necessity, deal directly with the *People* themselves. If a State government were menaced and in danger of subversion, then the nation would be called upon to aid the existing government of the State in sustaining itself against the impending danger. But the present case is a different one. The State government was subverted in each rebel State more than four years ago. The State, in its corporate capacity, went into rebellion; and as long as it had the power, waged and maintained against the nation rebellious war. There is no government in them to deal with. But there are the people. It is to the people we must go. It is through their people alone, and it is in their primary capacity alone, as people, unorganized and without a government, that the nation is capable now of dealing with them at all. And, therefore, the Government of the nation is obliged by the sheer necessity of the case, to know who are the people of the State, in the sense of the National Constitution, in order to know how to reach them. Congress, discerning new people, with new rights, and new duties, and new interests (of the nation itself even), springing from them, may rightfully stipulate in their behalf. If Congress perceives that it cannot fulfil its guarantee to all the people of a State, without such a stipulation, then it not only may, but it ought to require and secure it. The guarantee is one concerning *all*, not merely a *part* of the *People*. And, though the government of a State might be of republican form, and yet not enfranchise its colored citizens, still the substance and equity of the guarantee would be violated, if, in addition to their non-enfranchisement, the colored people should be compelled to share the burdens of a State Government, the benefits of which would enure to other classes—to their own exclusion. A republican form of government is not, of necessity, just and good. Nor is another form, of necessity, unjust and bad. A monarch may be humane, thoughtful, and just to every class and to every man. A republic may be inhumane, regardless of, and unjust to, some of its subjects. Our National Government and most of the State governments were so, to those whom they treated as slaves, or whose servitude they aggravated by their legislation in the interest of slavery. The Nation cannot hereafter pretend that it has kept its promise and fulfilled its guarantee, when it shall have only organized governments of republican *form*, unless it can look all the *people* in the face, and declare that it has kept its promise with them all. The voting class alone—those who possessed the franchise under the State Constitutions—were not the *People*. They never were the *People*. They are not now. They were simply the *Trustees* of a certain power, for the benefit of all the people, and not merely for their own advantage. The nation does not fulfil its guarantee by dealing with them alone. It may deal through them, with the people. It may accept their action as satisfactory, in its discretion. But no matter who may have been the agents through whom the nation reaches and deals with the people, that guarantee of the National Constitution is fatally violated, unless the nation secures to *all the People* of those disorganized States the substantial benefits and advantages of a *government*, for the common good, the just and equal protection of each and all.

But what of the policy of the President? I am not able to consider his future policy. It is undisclosed. He seems to me to have left to Congress alone, the questions controlling the conditions on which the rebel States shall resume their representative power in the Federal Government. It was not incumbent on the President to do otherwise. He naturally leaves the duty of theoretical reasoning to those whose responsibility it is to reach the just practical conclusion. Thus far the President has simply used, according to his proper discretion, the power of Commander-in-Chief. What method he should observe was a question of discretion, in the absence of any positive law, to be answered by himself. He might have assumed, in the absence of positive law—during the process of reorganization—purely military methods. Had that been needful, it would have been appropriate. If not necessary, then it would have been unjust and injurious. It is not just to oppress even an enemy, merely because we have the power. In a case like the present, it would be extremely impolitic, and injurious to the nation itself. Bear in mind, ours is not a conquest by barbarians, nor by despots; but by Christians and republicans. The Commander-in-Chief was bound to govern with a view to promoting the true restoration of the Union *power*, as I attempted to describe it in the beginning of this address; not merely with a view to the present immediate control of the daily conduct of the people. He deemed it wise, therefore, to resort to the democratic principle, to use the analogies of republicanism and of constitutional liberty. He had the power to govern through magistrates, under military or under civil titles. He could employ the agencies of popular and of representative assemblies. Their authority has its source, however, in his own war powers as Commander-in-Chief. If the peace of society, the rights of the government, and of all its subjects, are duly maintained, then the method may justify itself by its success as well as its intention. If he has assisted the people to reorganize their legislatures, and to re-establish the machinery of local State government, though his method may be less regular than if an act of Congress had prescribed it, still, it has permitted the people to feel their way back into the works and ways of loyalty, to exhibit their temper of mind, and to "show their hands." Was it not better for *the cause of free government, of civil liberty*, to incur the risk of error in that direction, than of error in the opposite one? It has proved that the national government is not drunk with power; that its four years' exercise of the dangerous rights of war has not affected its brain. It has shown that the danger of despotic centralism, or of central despotism, is safely over.

Meanwhile, notwithstanding the transmission of the seals to State magistrates chosen by vote in the States themselves; notwithstanding the inauguration, in fact, of local legislatures, the powers of war remain. The Commander-in-Chief has not abdicated. His generals continue in the field. They still exercise military functions, according to the belligerent rights of the nation. What the Commander-in-Chief may hereafter do, whether less or more, depends, I presume, in great measure on what the people of the rebel States may do or forbear doing. I assume that, until the Executive and Legislative department of the National Government shall have reached the *united* conclusion that the objects of the *war* have been fully accomplished, the national declaration of *peace* is not and cannot be made.

The proceedings already had are only certain acts in the great drama of Reorganization. They do not go for nothing; they were not unnecessary; nor do I approach them with criticism. But they are not the whole drama. Other acts are required for its completion. What they shall be, depends in part on the wisdom of Congress to determine.

The doctrine of the President that—in the steps preliminary to organizing a State which is not, and has not been theoretically cut off from the Union—he must recognize its own organic law, antecedent to the rebellion, need not be contested. I adhere, quite as strictly as he, to the logical consequences of that doctrine. I agree that the rebel States ought to come back again into the exercise of their State functions and the enjoyment of their representative power—by the action and by the votes of the same class of persons, namely, the same body of voters, or tenants of political rights and privileges, by the votes, action or submission of whom, those States were carried into the rebellion.

But yet it may be, at the same time, needful and proper, in the sense of wise statesmanship, to require of them the amplification of certain privileges, the recognition of certain rights, the establishment of certain institutions, the redistribution even of political power—to be by them accorded and executed through Constitutional Amendments or otherwise—as elements of acceptable reorganization; and as necessary to the readjustment of political society in harmony with the new relations, and the new basis of universal freedom, resulting from the rebellion itself. If these things are found to be required by wise statesmanship, then the right to exact them, as conditions of restoring those States to the enjoyment of their normal functions, is to be found just where the nation found the right to crush the rebellion and the incidental right of emancipating slaves.

Now, distinctions between men, as to their rights, purely arbitrary, and not founded in reason, nor in the nature of things, are not wise, statesmanlike, nor "Republican," in the constitutional sense. If they ever are wise and statesmanlike, they become so only where oligarchies, privileged orders, and hereditary aristocracies are wise and expedient.

There are two kinds of republican government, however, known to political science, viz: Aristocratic Republics and Democratic Republics, or those in which the government resides with a few persons, or with a privileged body, and those in which it is the government of the people. I cannot doubt that nearly all men are prepared to admit that our Governments—both State and National—are constitutionally Democratic, representative republics. That theory of government is expressly set forth in the Declaration of Independence. The popular theory of government is again declared in the preamble to the Federal Constitution. The Federal Government is elaborately constructed according to the theory of popular and representative government, and against the aristocratic theory, in its distinguishing features. And in divers places, the Federal Constitution in set terms pre-supposes the democratic and representative character of the governments of the States; for example, by assuming that they have legislatures, that their legislatures are composed of more than one body, and by aiming to prevent even all appearance of aristocratic form, by prohibiting the States from granting any title of nobility. In his recent message to Congress, President Johnson affirms "the great distinguishing principle of the recognition of the *rights of man*" as the fundamental idea, in all our governments. "The American system," he adds in the same paragraph, "rests on the assertion of the *equal right* of every man to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, to freedom of conscience, to the culture and exercise of all his faculties."

But is it pretended that the idea of a government of the People, and for the People, in the American sense, is inclusive of the white race only, or is exclusive of men of African descent? On what ground can the position rest?

The citizenship of free men of color, even in those States where no provision of law seemed to include them in the category of voters, has been frequently demonstrated, not only as a legal right, but as a right asserted and enjoyed.

Nay, more; both under the confederation, and at the time of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, all free native born inhabitants of the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, and North Carolina, though descended from African slaves, were not only citizens of those States, but such of them as had the other necessary qualifications, possessed the franchise of electors on equal terms with other citizens. And even Virginia declares, in her ancient Bill of Rights, "that all men having sufficient evidence of permanent common interest with, and attachment to, the community, have the right of suffrage." Wherever free colored men were recognized as free citizens or subjects, but were, nevertheless, not fully enfranchised, I think the explanation is found, not in the fact of their mere color, nor of their antecedent servitude, but in the idea of their possible lapse into servitude again—of which condition their color was a badge and a continuing presumption. The policy of some States seems to have demanded that slavery should be the prevailing condition of all their inhabitants of African descent. In those States, the possession of freedom by a colored man has therefore been treated as if that condition was only exceptional and transient. But, wherever the policy and legislation of a State were originally dictated by men who saw through the confusion of ideas occasioned by the presence of slavery, there we are enabled to discern the evidence of an unclouded purpose (with which the American mind always intended to be consistent), viz: *The maintenance of equality between free citizens concerning civil* RIGHTS, *and the distribution of* PRIVILEGES *according to capacity and desert, and not according to the accidents of birth.* And now that slavery has been rendered forever impossible within any State or Territory of the Union, by framing the great natural law of Universal Freedom into the organic law of the Union, all the ancient disabilities which slavery had made apparently attendant on African descent, must disappear.

Whatever may be the rules regulating the distribution of political power among free citizens, in the organization of such a Republican Government as that guaranteed by the National Constitution, *descent* is neither the evidence of right, nor the ground of disfranchisement.

The selection of a fraction or class, of the great body of freemen in the civil state, to be permanently invested with its entire political power—(selected by mere human predestination, irrespective of merit)—that power to be incommunicable to the freemen of another class—the two classes, of rulers and ruled, governors and governed, to be determined by the accident of birth, and all the consequences of that accident to descend by generation to their children—seems to me to be the establishment of an hereditary aristocracy of birth, the creation of a privileged order, inconsistent both with the substance and the essential form of American Republicanism, unstatesmanlike and unwise; and (in the rebel States) in every sense, dangerous and unjust.

To demand a certain qualification of intelligence is eminently safe, and consists with the interests and rights of all. It is as reasonable as to require a certain maturity of age. They who are the representatives of the political power of society, acting not only for themselves, but also for the women and children, who, too, belong to it, representing the interests of the wives, mothers, sisters, daughters, infant sons, and the posterity of us all, ought to constitute an audience reasonably competent to hear. And since the congregation of American voters is numbered by millions, and covers a continent, it cannot hear with its ears all that it needs to know, but must learn intelligently much that it needs to know, through the printed page and by means of its eyes. The protection of the mass of men against the deceptions of local demagogues, and against their own prejudices hereafter—as well as the common safety—calls for the requirement of the capacity to read the mother tongue, as a condition of coming for the first time to the ballot-box. Let this be required at the South, and immediately the whole Southern community will be aroused to the absolute necessity of demanding free schools and popular education. These are, more than all things else, to be coveted, both for the preservation of public liberty, and for the temporal salvation of the toiling masses, of our own Saxon and Norman blood, whom alike with the African slave, the oppression of ages has involved in a common disaster.

I think the wisest and most intelligent persons in the South are not ignorant of the importance of raising the standard of intelligence among voters, nor of extending the right to vote, so as to include those who are of competent intellect, notwithstanding the recent disability of color. There is evidence that they are not unwilling to act consistently with the understanding, example, and constitutional precedents of the fathers of the Republic: consistently with the ancient practice of the States, coeval with the organic law of the nation, established by the very men who made that law, who used and adopted the very phrase, "a republican form of government," of the meaning of which their own practice was a contemporary interpretation. But if the conquering power of the nation, if the victorious arm of the Union is paralyzed; if the Federal Government, standing behind the ramparts of defensive war, wielding its weapons, both of offense in the hour of struggle, and of diplomacy in the hour of triumph, is utterly powerless to stipulate for the execution of this condition; then I confess I do not know how the best and wisest in the South will be enabled, deserted and alone, to stand up on its behalf, against the jealousy of ignorance and the traditions of prejudice.

If the measures I have attempted to delineate are found to be impracticable, then Congress has still the right to refuse to the rebel States re-admission to the enjoyment of their representative power, until amendments to the *Federal Constitution* shall have been obtained adequate to the exigency. Nor can the people of the rebel States object to the delay. They voluntarily withdrew from Congress; they themselves elected the attitude of disunion. They broke the agreements of the Constitution; not we. They chose their own time, opportunity, and occasion to make war on the Nation and to repudiate the Union. They certainly cannot now dictate to us the time nor the terms of re-union Again, I repeat, the just discretion of the nation—exercised in good faith toward all—must govern.

The Federal Union was formed, first of all, "*to establish justice.*" "JUSTICE," in the language of statesmen and of jurists, has had a definition, for more than two thousand years, exact, perfect, and well understood.

It is found in the Institutes of Justinian:

"Constans et perpetua voluntas, jus suum cuique tribuendi."

"The constant and perpetual will to secure TO EVERY MAN HIS OWN RIGHT."

I believe I have shown that under our Federal Constitution—

1. All the people of the rebel States must share in the benefits to be derived from the execution of the national guarantee of republican governments.

2. That *our* "republican form of government" demands "*The maintenance of equality between free citizens concerning civil* RIGHTS, *and the distribution of* PRIVILEGES, *according to capacity and desert, and not according to the accidents of birth.*"

3. That people "of African descent," not less than people of the white race, are included within the category of free subjects and citizens of the United States.

4. That in the distribution of political power, under our form of government, "DESCENT *is neither the evidence of right, nor the ground of disfranchisement;*" so that—

5. The disfranchisement of free citizens, for the cause of "*descent*," or for any reason other than lawful disqualification, as by non-residence, immaturity, crime, or want of intelligence, violates their constitutional rights.

6. That in executing our national guarantee of republican government to the people of the rebel States, we must secure the constitutional, civic liberties and franchises of all the people.

7. That we have *no right* to omit to secure to the new citizens, made free by the Union, in war, their equality of rights before the law, and their franchises of every sort—including the electoral franchise—according to laws and regulations of universal, and not of unequal and capricious, application.

We have no right to evade our own duty. We must not, by substituting a new basis for the apportionment of representatives in Congress, give up the just rights of these citizens. Increasing the proportion or the political power of the loyal States, at the expense of the disloyal States, by adopting their relative numbers of *legal voters*, instead of their relative *populations*—while it might punish some States for not according the suffrage to colored men—would not be justice to the colored citizen. For *justice* demands, "*for every man* HIS OWN *right.*"

Will it be said that by such means we shall strengthen our own power in the loyal States, to protect the colored people in the South? If we will not yield to them *justice* now, on what ground do we expect grace to give them "*protection*" hereafter?

You will have compromised for a consideration—paid in an increase of your own political power—your right to urge their voluntary enfranchisement on the white men of the South. You will have bribed all the elements of political selfishness, in the whole country, to combine against negro enfranchisement. The States of the rebellion will have no less power than ever in the Senate. And the men who hold the privilege of electing representatives to the lower house will retain their privilege. For the sake of doubling the delegation from South Carolina, do you suppose the monopoly of choosing three members would be surrendered by the whites, giving to the colored men the chance to choose six? Nay:—Would the monopolists gain anything by according the suffrage to the colored man, if they could themselves only retain the power to dictate three representatives, and the colored people should dictate the selection of the other three?

The scheme to substitute legal voters, instead of population, as the basis of representation in Congress, will prove a delusion and a snare. By diminishing the representative power of the Southern States, in favor of other States, you will not increase Southern love for the Union. Nor, while Connecticut and Wisconsin refuse the suffrage to men of color, will you be able to convince the South that your amendment was dictated by political principle, and not by political cupidity. You will not diminish any honest apprehension of extending the suffrage, but you will inflame every prejudice and aggravate discontent. Meanwhile, the disfranchised freedman, hated by some because he is black, contemned by some because he has been a slave, feared by some because of the antagonisms of society, is condemned to the condition of a hopeless pariah of a merciless civilization. *In* the community, he is not *of* it. He neither belongs to a master, nor to society. Bodily present in the midst of the society composing the State, he adds nothing to its weight in the political balance of the nation; and therefore, he stands in the way, occupies the room, and takes the place, which might be enjoyed as opportunities by a white immigrant, who would contribute by his presence to its representative power. Your policy would inflame animosity and aggravate oppression, for at least the lifetime of a generation, before it would open the door to enfranchisement.

Civil society is not an aggregation of individuals. According to the order of nature, and of the Divine economy, it is an aggregation of families.

The adult males of the family *vote;* because the welfare of the women and children of the family is identical with theirs; and it is intrusted to their affection and fidelity, whether at the ballot-box, or on the battle-field. But while the voting men of a given community represent the welfare of its women and children, they do not represent that of another community. The men, women, and children of Massachusetts, are alike concerned in the ideas and interests of Massachusetts. But the very theory of representation implies that the ideas and interests of one State are not identical with those of another. On what ground, then, can a State on the Pacific, or the Ohio, gain preponderance in Congress over New Jersey or Massachusetts by reason of its greater number of *males*, while it may have even a less number of *people?* The halls of legislation are the arenas of debate, not of muscular prowess. The intelligence, the opinions, the wishes, and the influence of women, social and domestic, stand for something—for much—in the public affairs of civilized and refined society. I deny the just right of the Government to banish woman from the count. She may not vote, but she thinks; she persuades her husband; she instructs her son. And through them, at least, she has a right to be heard in the government. Her existence, and the existence of her children, are to be considered in the State.

No matter who changes; let Massachusetts, at least, stand by all the fundamental principles of free, constitutional, republican government.

The President is the tribune of the People. Let him be chosen directly by the popular election. The Senate represents the reserved rights and the equality of the States. Let the Senators continue to be chosen by the Legislatures of the States. The House represents the opinions, interests, and the equality of the *people* of each and every State. Let the people of the respective States elect their representatives, in numbers proportional to the numbers of their people. And let the legal qualifications of the voters, in the election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress, be fixed by a uniform, equal, democratic, constitutional rule, of universal application. Let this franchise be enjoyed "*according to capacity and desert and not according to the accidents of birth.*"

Congress may, and ought, to initiate an amendment granting the right to vote for President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress, to colored men, in all the States, being citizens and able to read, who would by the laws of the States where they reside, be competent to vote if they were white. Without disfranchising existing voters, it should apply the qualification to white men also. And the amendment ought to leave the election of President and Vice-President directly in the hands of the People, without the intervention of electoral colleges. Then the poorest, humblest, and most despised men, being citizens and competent to read, and thus competent with reasonable intelligence to represent others, would find audience through the ballot-box. The President, who is the Grand Tribune of all the People, and the direct delegates of the People in the popular branch of the National Legislature, would feel their influence. This amendment would give efficiency to the one already adopted, abolishing slavery throughout the Union. The two amendments, taken together, would practically accomplish, or enable Congress to fulfil, the whole duty of the nation to those who are now its dependent wards.

I am satisfied that the mass of thinking men at the South accept the present condition of things in good faith; and I am also satisfied that with the support of a firm policy from the President and Congress, in aid of the efforts of their good faith, and with the help of a conciliatory and generous disposition on the part of the North—especially on the part of those States most identified with the plan of emancipation—the measures needed for permanent and universal welfare can surely be obtained. There ought now to be *a vigorous prosecution of the Peace*—just as vigorous as our recent prosecution of the War. We ought to extend our hands with cordial good-will to meet the proffered hands of the South; demanding no attitude of humiliation from any; inflicting no acts of humiliation upon any; respecting the feelings of the conquered—notwithstanding the question of right and wrong between the parties belligerent. We ought, by all the means and instrumentalties of peace, and by all the thrifty methods of industry; by all the re-creative agencies of education and religion, to help rebuild the waste places, and restore order, society, prosperity. Without industry and business there can be no progress. In their absence, civilized man even recedes toward barbarism. Let Massachusetts bear in mind the not unnatural suspicion which the past has engendered. I trust she is able, filled with emotions of boundless joy, and gratitude to Almighty God, who has given such victory and such honor to the right, to exercise faith in his goodness, without vain glory, and to exercise charity, without weakness, towards those who have held the attitude of her enemies.

The offence of war has met its appropriate punishment by the hand of *War*.

In this hour of triumph, honor and religion alike forbid one act, one word, of vengeance or resent-

ment. Patriotism and Christianity unite the arguments of earthly welfare and the motives of Heavenly inspiration to persuade us to put off all jealousy and all fear, and to move forward as citizens and as men, in the work of social and economic reorganization—each one doing with his might whatever his hand findeth to do.

We might wish it were possible for Massachusetts justly to avoid her part in the work of *political* reorganization. But in spite of whatever misunderstanding of her purpose or character, she must abide her destiny. She is a part of the Nation. The Nation, for its own ends, and its own advantage, as a measure of war, took out of the hands of the masters their slaves. It holds them, therefore, in its hands, as freedmen. It must place them somewhere. It must dispose of them somehow. It cannot delegate the trust. It has no right to drop them, to desert them. For, by its own voluntary act, it assumed their guardianship, and all its attendant responsibilities; before the present generation, and all the coming generations of mankind. I know not how well, nor how ill, they might be treated by the people of the States where they reside. I only know that there is a point beyond which the Nation has no right to incur any hazard. And while the fidelity of the Nation need not abridge the humanity of the States; on the other hand, our confidence in these States cannot be pleaded before the bar of God, nor of history, in defence of any neglect of our own duty.

Let their people remember that Massachusetts has never deceived them. To her ideas of duty and her theory of the Government, she has been faithful. If they were ever misled or betrayed by others into the snare of attempted secession, and the risks of war, her trumpet at least gave no uncertain sound. She has fulfilled her engagements in the past, and she intends to fulfil them in the future. She knows that the reorganization of the States in rebellion carries with it consequences which come home to the firesides and the consciences of her own children. For, as citizens of the Union, they become liable to assume the defence of those governments, when reorganized, against every menace, whether of foreign invasion or of domestic violence. Her bayonets may be invoked to put down insurgents of whatever color; and whatever the cause, whether rightful or wrongful, which may have moved their discontent. And when they are called for, they will march. If she were capable of evading her duty now, she would be capable of violating her obligations hereafter. If she is anxious to prevent grave errors, it is because she appreciates, from her past experience, the danger of admitting such errors into the structure of government. She is watchful against them now, because, in the sincere fidelity of her purpose, she is made keenly alive to the duties of the present, by contemplating the inevitable responsibilities of the future.

In sympathy with the heart and hope of the nation, she will abide by her faith. Undisturbed by the impatient, undismayed by delay, "with malice toward none, with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right," she will persevere. Impartial, democratic, constitutional liberty is invincible. The rights of human nature are sacred; maintained by confessors, and heroes, and martyrs; reposing on the sure foundation of the commandments of GOD.

"Through plots and counterplots;
Through gain and loss; through glory and disgrace;
Along the plains where passionate Discord rears
Eternal Babel; still the holy stream
Of *human happiness* glides on!
* * * *
There is ONE above
Sways the harmonious mystery of the world."

Gentlemen: For all the favors, unmerited and unmeasured, which I have enjoyed from the people of Massachusetts; from the counsellors, magistrates, and officers by whom I have been surrounded in the government; and from the members of five successive Legislatures; there is no return in my power to render, but the sincere acknowledgments of a grateful heart.

THE LIBERATOR.

SALUTATORY.

From the Liberator of January 1st, 1831.

IN the month of August, I issued proposals for publishing the *Liberator* in Washington city; but the enterprise, though hailed in different sections of the country, was palsied by public indifference. Since that time, the removal of the *Genius of Universal Emancipation* to the Seat of Government, has rendered less imperious the establishment of a similar periodical in that quarter.

During my recent tour for the purpose of exciting the minds of the people by a series of discourses on the subject of slavery, every place that I visited gave fresh evidence of the fact, that a greater revolution in public sentiment was to be effected in the Free States—and particularly in New England—than at the South. I found contempt more bitter, detraction more relentless, prejudice more stubborn, and apathy more frozen, than among slave-owners themselves. Of course there were individual exceptions to the contrary. This state of things afflicted, but did not dishearten me. I determined, at every hazard, to lift up the standard of emancipation in the eyes of the nation, within sight of Bunker Hill, and in the birth-place of Liberty. That standard is now unfurled; and long may it float, unhurt by the spoliations of time, or the missiles of a desperate foe—yea, till every chain be broken, and every bondman set free! Let Southern oppressors tremble—let their secret abettors tremble—let their Northern apologists tremble—let all the enemies of the persecuted blacks tremble!

I deem the publication of my original prospectus unnecessary, as it has obtained a wide circulation. The principles therein inculcated will be steadily pursued in this paper, excepting that I shall not array myself as the political partisan of any man. In defending the great cause of human rights, I wish to derive the assistance of all religions and of all parties.

Assenting to the "self-evident truths" maintained in the American Declaration of Independence, "that all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"—I shall strenuously contend for the immediate enfranchisement of our slave population.

I am aware that many object to the severity of my language; but is there not cause for severity? I *will* be as harsh as truth, and as uncompromising as justice. On this subject I do not wish to think, or speak, or write, with moderation. No! no! Tell a man whose house is on fire to give a moderate alarm; tell him to moderately rescue his wife from the hands of the ravisher; tell the mother to gradually extricate her babe from the fire into which it has fallen; but urge me not to use moderation in a case like the present. I am in earnest—I will not equivocate—I will not excuse—I will not retreat a single inch—AND I WILL BE HEARD. The apathy of the people is enough to make every statue leap from its pedestal, and to hasten the resurrection of the dead!

It is pretended that I am retarding the cause of emancipation by the coarseness of my invective, and the precipitancy of my measures. The charge is not true. On this question my influence, humble as it is, is felt at this moment to a considerable extent, and shall be felt in coming years—not perniciously, but beneficially—not as a curse but as a blessing; and posterity will bear testimony that I was right. I desire to thank God that he enables me to disregard "the fear of man that bringeth a snare," and to speak his truth in its simplicity and power. And here I close with this fresh dedication:

"Oppression! I have seen thee, face to face,
And met thy cruel eyes and cloudy brow;
But thy soul-withering glance I fear not now—
For dread to prouder feelings doth give place
Of deep abhorrence! Scorning the disgrace
Of slavish knees that at thy footstool bow,
I also kneel—but with far other vow
Do hail thee and thy herd of hirelings base:—
I swear, while life-blood warms my throbbing veins,
Still to oppose and thwart, with heart and hand,
Thy brutalizing sway—till Afric's chains
Are burst, and Freedom rules the rescued land,—
Trampling Oppression and his iron rod:
Such is the vow I take—SO HELP ME, GOD!"

WM. LLOYD GARRISON.

Boston, January 1, 1831.

VALEDICTORY.

THE LAST NUMBER OF THE LIBERATOR.

"The last! the last! the last!
O, by that little word
How many thoughts are stirred—
That sister of THE PAST!"

THE present number of the *Liberator* is the completion of its thirty-fifth volume, and the termination of its existence.

Commencing my editorial career when only twenty years of age, I have followed it continuously till I have attained my sixtieth year—first, in connection with the *Free Press*, in Newburyport, in the spring of 1826; next, with *The National Philanthropist*, in Boston, in 1827; next, with *The Journal of the Times*, in Bennington, Vt., in 1828-9; next, with *The Genius of Universal Emancipation*, in Baltimore, in 1829-30; and, finally, with the *Liberator*, in Boston, from the 1st of January, 1831, to the 1st of January, 1866;—at the start, probably the youngest member of the editorial fraternity in the land; now, perhaps, the oldest, not in years, but in continuous service,—unless Mr. Bryant, of the New York *Evening Post*, be an exception.

Whether I shall again be connected with the press, in a similar capacity, is quite promblematical; but, at my period of life, I feel no prompting to start a new journal at my own risk, and with the certainty of struggling against wind and tide, as I have done in the past.

I began the publication of the *Liberator* without a subscriber, and I end it—it gives me unalloyed satisfaction to say—without a farthing as the pecuniary result of the patronage extended to it during thirty-five years of unremitted labors.

From the immense change wrought in the national feeling and sentiment on the subject of slavery, the *Liberator* derived no advantage at any time in regard to its circulation. The original "disturber of the peace," nothing was left undone at the beginning, and up to the hour of the late rebellion, by Southern slaveholding villany on the one hand, and Northern pro-slavery malice on the other, to represent it as too vile a sheet to be countenanced by any claiming to be Christian or patriotic; and it always required rare moral courage or singular personal independence to be among its patrons. Never had a journal to look such opposition in the face—never was one so constantly belied and caricatured. If it had advocated all the crimes forbidden by the moral law of God and the statutes of the State, instead of vindicating the sacred claims of oppressed and bleeding humanity, it could not be more vehemently denounced or more indignantly repudiated. To this day—such is the force of prejudice—there are multitudes who cannot be induced to read a single number of it, even on the score of curiosity, though their views on the slavery question are now precisely those which it has uniformly advocated. Yet no journal has been conducted with such fairness and impartiality; none has granted such freedom in its columns to its opponents; none has so scrupulously and uniformly presented all sides of every question discussed in its pages; none has so readily and exhaustively published, without note or comment, what its enemies have said to its disparagement, and the villification of its editor; none has vindicated primitive Christianity, in its spirit and purpose—"the higher law," in its supremacy over nations and governments as well as individual conscience—the Golden Rule, in its binding obligation upon all classes—the Declaration of Independence, with its self-evident truths—the rights of human nature, without distinction of race, complexion or sex—more earnestly or more uncompromisingly; none has exerted a higher moral or more broadly reformatory influence upon those who have given it a careful perusal; and none has gone beyond it in asserting the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. All this may be claimed for it without egotism or presumption. It has ever been "a terror to evil-doers, and a praise to them that do well." It has excited the fierce hostility of all that is vile and demoniacal in the land, and won the affection and regard of the purest and noblest of the age. To me it has been unspeakably cheering, and the richest compensation for whatever of peril, suffering and defamation I have been called to encounter, that one uniform testimony has been borne, by those who have had its weekly perusal, as to the elevating and quickening influence of the *Liberator* upon their character and lives; and the deep grief they are expressing in view of its discontinuance is overwhelmingly affecting to my feelings. Many of these date their subscription from the commencement of the paper, and they have allowed nothing in its columns to pass without a rigid scrutiny. They speak, therefore, experimentally, and "testify of that which they have seen and do know." Let them be assured that my regret in the separation which is to take place between us, in consequence of the discontinuance of the *Liberator*, is at least as poignant as their own; and let them feel, as I do, comforted by the thought that it relates only to the weekly method of communicating with each other, and not to the principles we have espoused in the past, or the hopes and aims we cherish as to the future.

Although the *Liberator* was designed to be, and has ever been, mainly devoted to the abolition of slavery, yet it has been instrumental in aiding the cause of reform in many of its most important aspects.

I have never consulted either the subscription list of the paper or public sentiment in printing, or omitting to print, any article touching any matter whatever. Personally, I have never asked any one to become a subscriber, nor any one to contribute to its support, nor presented its claims for a better circulation in any lecture or speech, or at any one of the multitudinous anti-slavery gatherings in the land. Had I done so, no doubt its subscription list might have been much enlarged.

In this connection, I must be permitted to express my surprise that I am gravely informed, in various quarters, that this is no time to retire from public labor; that though the claims of the captive have been broken, he is yet to be vindicated in regard to the full possession of equal civil and political rights; that the freedmen in every part of the South are subjected to many insults and outrages; that the old slaveholding spirit is showing itself in every available form; that there is imminent danger that, in the hurry of reconstruction and re-admission to the Union, the late rebel States will be left free to work any amount of mischief; that there is manifestly a severe struggle yet to come with the Southern "powers of darkness," which will require the utmost vigilance and the most determined efforts on the part of the friends of impartial liberty—etc., etc., etc. Surely, it is not meant by all this that I am therefore bound to continue the publication of the *Liberator*; for this is a matter for me to determine, and no one else. As I commenced its publication without asking leave of any one, so I claim to be competent to decide when it may fitly close its career.

Again—it cannot be meant, by this presentation of the existing state of things at the South, either to impeach my intelligence, or to impute to me a lack of interest in behalf of that race, for the liberation and elevation of which I have labored so many years. If, when they had no friends, and no hope of earthly redemption, I did not hesitate to make their cause my own, is it to be supposed that, with their yokes broken, and their friends and advocates multiplied indefinitely, I can be any the less disposed to stand by them to the last—to insist on the full measure of justice and equity being meted out to them—to retain in my breast a lively and permanent interest in all that relates to their present condition and future welfare?

I shall sound no trumpet and make no parade as to what I shall do for the future. After having gone through with such a struggle as has never been paralleled in duration in the life of any reformer, and for nearly forty years been the target at which all poisonous and deadly missiles have been hurled, and having seen our great national iniquity blotted out, and freedom "proclaimed throughout all the land to all the inhabitants thereof," and a thousand presses and pulpits supporting the claims of the colored population to fair treatment where not one could be found to do this in the early days of the anti-slavery conflict,—I might—it seems to me—be permitted to take a little repose in my advanced years, if I desired to do so. But, as yet, I have neither asked nor wished to be relieved of any burdens or labors connected with the good old cause. I see a mighty work of enlightenment and regeneration yet to be accomplished at the South, and many cruel wrongs done to the freedmen which are yet to be redressed; and I neither counsel others to turn away from the field of conflict, under the delusion that no more remains to be done, nor contemplate such a course in my own case.

The object for which the *Liberator* was commenced—the extermination of chattel slavery—having been gloriously consummated, it seems to me specially appropriate to let its existence cover the historic period of the great struggle; leaving what remains to be done to complete the work of emancipation to other instrumentalities (of which I hope to avail myself), under new auspices, with more abundant means, and with millions instead of hundreds for allies.

Most happy am I to be no longer in conflict with the mass of my fellow-countrymen on the subject of slavery. For no man of any refinement or sensibility can be indifferent to the approbation of his fellow-men, if it be rightly earned. But to obtain it by going with the multitude to do evil—by pandering to despotic power or a corrupt public sentiment—is self-degradation and personal dishonor:

"For more true joy Marcellus exiled feels,
Than Cæsar with a senate at his heels."

Better to be always in a minority of one with God—branded as madman, incendiary, fanatic, heretic, infidel—frowned upon by "the powers that be," and mobbed by the populace—or consigned ignominously to the gallows, like him whose "soul is marching on," though his "body lies mouldering in the grave," or burnt to ashes at the stake like Wickliffe, or nailed to the cross like him who "gave himself for the world"—in defence of the right, than like Herod, having the shouts of a multitude, crying, "It is the voice of a god, and not of a man!"

Farewell, tried and faithful patrons! Farewell, generous benefactors, without whose voluntary but essential pecuniary contributions the *Liberator* must have long since been discontinued!—Farewell, noble men and women who have wrought so long and so successfully, under God, to break every yoke! Hail, ye ransomed millions! Hail, year of jubilee! With a grateful heart and a fresh baptism of the soul, my last invocation shall be—

"Spirit of Freedom! on—
Oh! pause not in thy flight
Till every clime is won
To worship in thy light:
Speed on thy glorious way,
And wake the sleeping lands!
Millions are watching for the ray,
And lift to thee their hands.
Still "Onward!" be thy cry—
Thy banner on the blast:
And, like a tempest, as thou rushest by,
Despots shall shrink aghast.
On! till thy name is known
Throughout the peopled earth;
On! till thou reign'st alone,
Man's herritage by birth;
On! till from every vale, and where the mountains rise,
The beacon lights of Liberty shall kindle to the skies!"

WM. LLOYD GARRISON.

Boston, December 29, 1865.

HOW THE MONEY GOES IN NEW YORK.—According to a report just made by the City Comptroller, the amount paid to Cummings J. Tucker, Superintendent of the new Court House, for services during the past *six months*, amounts to the pretty sum of $20,265, or five per cent. upon the expenditures. Previous to this, Mr. Tucker received the handsome salary of $4,000 a year for overlooking the building. This new Court House, the *Express* says, will be remembered in history as one of the most enormous swindles ever recorded in the existence of the city. Already it has cost $1,250,000, upon on outside estimate of expenditure of $750,000 or $800,000; and by the time it is completed, if it ever should be completed, the cost will probably be nearly $3,000,000. Besides this $20,265 paid Mr. Tucker for six months' service, and with something still due him as alleged, the architect, Mr. Kellum, has been paid for this year's service, so far, the round sum of $24,000.

FOREIGN POPULATION.—New York, with 806,650 population has 47.62 per cent. of foreign born people; Philadelphia, with 585,529, has 28.93 per cent.; Brooklyn, with 266,661, has 39.22; Baltimore, with 212,418, has 24.71; Boston, with 177,812, has 35.88; New Orleans, with 168,675, has 38.31; Cincinnati, with 161,044, has 45.71; St. Louis, with 160,773, has 59.76; Chicago, with 109,260, has 49.99.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 13, 1866.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.

NO STATE SHALL MAKE ANY DISTINCTION IN CIVIL RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES AMONG THE NATURALIZED CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES RESIDING WITHIN ITS LIMITS, OR AMONG PERSONS BORN ON ITS SOIL OF PARENTS PERMANENTLY RESIDENT THERE, ON ACCOUNT OF RACE, COLOR, OR DESCENT.

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

THERE will be a Special Meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society at Boston, on WEDNESDAY, January 24, 1866, to consider the State of National Affairs. The meeting will be held at the Melodeon. The morning session will commence at 10 a.m. The afternoon session at 3 p.m.

By order of the Executive Committee,
WENDELL PHILLIPS, President.
C. K. WHIPPLE, Secretary.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

THE Thirty-third Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society is hereby notified to be held at the MELODEON, in Boston, on Thursday, January 25th, 1866, commencing at half-past 10 o'clock, a. m., and continuing during the day and evening.

A full attendance is requested, of the members of the Society particularly.

The duty of the Society, and the proper course to be pursued by it in existing circumstances, will doubtless be the leading subject of inquiry at the meeting,—opening the consideration of the affairs of the country, in its Present and in regard to its Future.

In behalf of the Board of Managers,
EDMUND QUINCY, President.

THE STEP BACKWARD.

WE can best understand how much the Anti-Slavery cause has lost by the vacillation of the Secretary of State and the treachery of President Johnson, when we go back to the time of the surrender of the rebel Gen. Johnston. When Gen. Sherman met his Confederate opponent in North Carolina, a conference took place which resulted in the preparation of a memorandum on the part of Gen. Sherman. The points of Sherman's agreement were that the Federal Government should recognize the State Governments; that where new States had been formed, the Supreme Court should decide upon their legality; that the inhabitants were guaranteed the rights of person and property, and all political rights and franchises. When the nation heard of the agreement of the General,—there was a thrill of horror. Was it possible, we said, that the bold, daring, brilliant, unconquerable Sherman, after performing so many deeds of valor, after showing such a consummate genius in the art of war, had been played upon by his rebel adversaries as though he were a child? "Sherman has surrendered to Johnston" men said with sorrow. "The rebels defeated in the field are victorious in the Cabinet." The new Administration, with a President whose wrath against traitors had been resounding from every platform,—who was represented to be foaming for the blood of some detested traitor,—was regarded as an Administration of vengeance and executions. We had a Secretary of War who was as full of anger. The murder of Mr. Lincoln had intensified the feeling, and there was a general desire for some conspicuous example of national vengeance. The moment the memorandum of Sherman came to Washington, the Cabinet was called together. The arrangement was indignantly repudiated. Grant was bidden to go post haste to the front for fear that the entrapped Sherman might already have given over his army to the rebels, and be receiving orders from "Secretary" Breckinridge. The Washington *Chronicle*, edited by that officious time-server, Forney, threw out the suspicion that perhaps after all Sherman was a Copperhead, and was bidding for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency. Orders were given countermanding those of Sherman; and Halleck, for once in his life, exhibited a marvellous celerity of movement. Stanton, on the part of the bloodthirsty Administration, wrote the reasons for the Government's action. Among the points of Mr. Stanton's reply were these: That Sherman's plan proposed to restore Rebel authority in the respective States; that it subjected loyal citizens of Rebel States to debt contracted by Rebels in the name of the State; that it practically abolished confiscation laws, and absolved Rebels of every degree, who had slaughtered our people, from all pains and penalties for their crimes, and that it "relieved Rebels from the presence of our victories," and left them in a condition to renew their efforts to overthrow the United States Government. To this reply the country said "Amen."

Events have shown that when Gen. Sherman made his agreement with Joe Johnston, he acted with his accustomed sagacity. Perhaps, if the obligation that seals the lips of a soldier were lifted, he might give us an explanation of the matter. It is very certain that he anticipated the policy which has governed the Administration from that time to the present. In what respect has the Administration differed from Sherman? Stanton's memorandum, received by the *Chronicle* and kindred organs of superserviceable loyalty, with screaming rapture, has been disapproved point by point, by the very men who framed it. Gen. Sherman was denounced for restoring Rebel authority in the respective States. Johnson has done this. Rebels fresh from battle-fields stained with loyal blood,—the ink scarcely dry on their paroles, their pardons unsigned—were placed in charge of States and instructed to call Conventions and arrange Constitutions; pass that Constitutional Amendment, and then send crippled rubels to hobble into the seats they abandoned five years since. Gen. Sherman was denounced for subjecting loyal citizens of rebel States to debt contracted by rebels in the name of the same State. This Andrew Johnson has done. The rebel States have been allowed to escape taxation, and at the same time raise loans to pension rebel soldiers, and pay State debts; and when they return to Congress, to hold their electoral votes as a price for the payment of the Confederate debt by the most aspiring candidate for the Presidency. Gen. Sherman was denounced for practically abolishing confiscation laws. The President took a step in advance even of the recreant Sherman, and absolutely abolished these laws. Nay, more, after permitting his agents to enter into contracts with the negroes on the Sea Islands—to cultivate the abandoned lands and double them in value, he proposes to break this contract; to turn the negroes out to poverty and want, and replace the rebel owners. He not only abolishes confiscation as it applies to the white rebels; but applies it to the loyal blacks. Gen. Sherman was denounced for relieving rebels of every degree who had slaughtered our people, from all pains and penalties for their crimes. The Administration has done this. The second rebel in rank, A. H. Stephens, had the formality of an honorable imprisonment, was released, welcomed to the White House, and sent home to Georgia with distinguished marks of Presidential consideration. Jefferson Davis himself was arrested—not as a traitor, as one who had directed the slaughter of our people; but as an accomplice of Booth in the murder of President Lincoln. Upon what one man have the pains and penalties of the rebellion fallen? Wirz was hanged as a cowardly propitiation, because he was poor, friendless, wretched. Howell Cobb endorsed Wirz, but no one has heard of any attempt to remove Howell Cobb from his Georgia plantation. Cobb was the commanding officer of Wirz. He was a general in the rebel army. He was not only a traitor, but to a certain extent guilty of the crimes of Andersonville. But he happened to be a Southern gentleman, and was permitted to go at large. Gen. Sherman was denounced for having relieved the rebels from the presence of our victories! The Administration has done this, first by recalling the negro troops, then by disarming the negroes, and finally by giving the rebels arms as militia organizations, thus, as Stanton felicitously expressed it—"leaving them in a condition to renew their efforts to overthrow the United States Government."

This comparison of the Administration's opinions now, with what it affected to believe six months ago, will show two things: First, that Andrew Johnson has attempted to betray the negro to the rebel in the South, and the Republican party to the Democratic party in the North. A coarse political manager, given to contriving in bar-rooms with men who have no principles, no ambition but success by whatever means, he saw in the electoral votes of the rebel States a source of political power. By pandering to their sectional prejudices, by affecting to be the breakwater between them and the blood-thirsty Northern Radicals, he would compel these States to accept his leadership, to vote for him as their Presidential candidate. With this view, he entered into negotiations with Dean Richmond and the New York Democracy. With this view he welcomed Haskin to the Presidential presence, and made a McClellan Democrat Surveyor of the Port of New York, and directed creatures like Forney to attack negro suffrage in Pennsylvania, after having sustained it. With this view, he threw his Administration against the cause in Connecticut, and defeated the Republican party there. We truly believe that but for the unexpected power of the Republican party in New York and Pennsylvania, he would now have Horatio Seymour, and George H. Pendleton, and Montgomery Blair, and J. W. Forney, and J. M. Botts in his Cabinet. His own party prevented his treachery to their organization, now let the nation rebuke him for treachery to the negro. We are tired with patience. An Administration beginning in intemperance and deceit, based upon treachery to freedom and its own party organization, sustained only by politicians who cling to portfolios and bureaus with the tenacity of death, can come to no good. Andrew Johnson's Administration is a shell. There is nothing left of it. The Republicans distrust, the Democrats dislike him. Let but the Republicans begin against Andrew Johnson the same crusade which the Anti-Lecompton leaders pursued against James Buchanan, and the people, we believe, would crown their courage with a similar triumph.

THE latest rumors on the admission of the rebel claimants are thus condensed in a Washington dispatch of Jan. 7:

"The Joint Committee of Congress on Reconstruction met yesterday at the Capitol—all of the members being present except Messrs. Bingham of Ohio and Grider of Kentucky. The customary resolution of secresy was passed, Senator Fessenden chosen chairman, and the Committee, after a conversational discussion, adjourned to meet on Tuesday next.

"The friends of the Tennessee delegation are not so hopeful to-night as they have been, as it is very evident that if the Tennesseans are admitted, the Floridians, who are equally loyal, should be, and that if the test oath is pronounced unconstitutional every Southern member could at once be admitted.

"There will be an attempt made in the Senate to take the credentials of the Tennessee claimants from the Joint Committee on Reconstruction and refer them to the Judiciary Committee.

"It is expected that several prominent Congressmen will speak on Reconstruction during the coming week, among them Senator Wade and Representative Boutwell."

Another dispatch adds:

"It is probable that the proposition to send a subcommittee to the various Southern States to obtain facts and information will be reported at an early day. It will meet with strong opposition in the House, on the ground that all the information necessary is already attained or speedily accessible through the records of the Freedmen's Bureau, the Bureau of Military Justice, and other branches of the War Department, not to say anything of the able reports already submitted on the subject, and the very full and impartial accounts of the condition of the South as given by the leading journals of the country from their able special correspondents."

GOV. BULLOCK of Massachusetts, who succeeds Gov. Andrew, concluded his inaugural address on Saturday as follows:

"Massachusetts and the Union—In this connection I have thought it proper to confine myself within these subjects which belong to our domestic administration. Another field lies beyond, broad as the republic, laden with painful anxiety but blossoming with transcendent hopes. It has been moistened all the way from the Capitol to the farthest lines of the whole expanse with the blood of the sons of Massachusetts, and she may be forgiven for asking, in the day of victory to which she contributed, that the fruits shall be equal to the sacrifice. So long as the States recently in rebellion shall continue to be unjust to half their own population it is vain to expect that they will be just to the other States of the Union. If they shall withhold from their own people rights of human nature, or of civil government, those who are thus deprived should be supported in their claims by the laws and by the arms of the United States. The return of those States to the national council, whether called restoration or readmission, should be conditioned upon emancipation in fact as well as by name—upon their full and solemn recognition of the equality of all men before the law. I have confidence that the President will fulfil the mission of his predecessor as the restorer of the Union and liberator of a race. But the Congress must be held also to perform its part. In war it was inevitable that the Executive overshadowed Congress; in peace it is necessary that Congress should resume the exercise of its prerogatives under the Constitution. I for one am willing to intrust to the Senators and Representatives of Massachusetts in that body the interest and the convictions of this ancient of States."

THE HOUSE on Monday passed the following important resolution:

Resolved, That in order to the maintenance of the national authority, and the protection of loyal citizens of the seceded States, it is the sense of the House that the military forces of the Government should not be withdrawn from those States until the two Houses of Congress shall have ascertained and declared that their further presence there is no longer necessary.

This was adopted by 94 to 37, the nays being Democrats, reinforced by Mr. Raymond and a few of his followers. It is in conflict with the opinion of the President as expressed in his last message, and is an indication, let us trust, of the temper in which the House resumes its session.

A WASHINGTON correspondent writes during the holidays:

"All appears to be quiet among the colored people, from the Potomac to the Rio Grande, although unmistakable attempts were made to excite them to forcible demonstrations of their determination to protect themselves against insult. Even at the executive mansion, where Mr. Lincoln last year received on New Year's day all who came, in the order of their coming, respectable colored citizens were told: '*No niggers admitted until after two o'clock.*' Many brave veterans went away in disgust, as they saw very imperfectly reconstructed white rebels admitted."

The incident is cause for regret and humiliation, but not for surprise.

A CORRESPONDENT of the President's organ, the N. Y. *Times*, remarks:

"The management of the Bureau in some of the Southern States, especially in Alabama, has been the only means by which fair legislation toward freedmen has even been *extorted* from the Legislature of that State. Gen Swayne, the assistant commissioner of that State, informed the authorities, in effect, that if the Legislature did not pass laws which would protect the freedmen in their civil rights, his courts must exercise that privilege until they did."

But the President says these States are in the most perfectly reconstructed condition, and their legislation for the freedmen "wise, just, and humane!"

A FREE lecture will be delivered by Col. James Trimble, of Tenn., at the Methodist Episcopal Church, Sullivan street, between Amity and Bleecker, on Tuesday evening, January 16th. Col. Trimble commanded the 14th regiment of U. S. colored troops, and has high testimonials as to his ability to speak on the condition of the South.

PERSONAL.

Mr. Bullock is the fourth Governor of Massachusetts from Worcester. John Davis died April 19, 1854. Levi Lincoln and Emory Washburn survive.

Gen. Logan is in Washington, and his friends are confident that he will be elected Senator from Illinois at the next meeting of the Legislature of that State.

—"Peace hath her victories
No less renowned than war."

Among the notable incidents at the Massachusetts State House, on the inauguration of Gov. Bullock, was the presence of ex-Gov. Gardner and Gen. Butler, walking arm-in-arm—at least, the Boston *Transcript* says so.

Garibaldi has offered his services to the authorities of Naples to nurse the cholera patients in the hospitals, but the Syndic of the city would not permit him thus to expose himself to danger. No act of Garibaldi's in the height of his military fame is nobler than this.

A. O. P. Nicholson, formerly Senator in Congress from Tennessee, having made application for his compensation between the time he left the Senate in 1861 to the period of his expulsion, his petition has been refused by the Secretary of the Senate.

It is asserted that Maj.-Gen. Merritt, now stationed in Texas, attended a public meeting there in an intoxicated condition, and indorsed a treasonable speech made by a rebel Judge named Hancock. Charges have been preferred by officers who were present, and will be investigated.

"Mr. Secretary Stanton," says "Perley," "in withdrawing from the position of eulogist of Abraham Lincoln, shows that he appreciates the situation of public affairs. There is a wide difference between some of the positions so gloriously taken by the deceased President and some of the official acts of his successors, and it will be a difficult task to eulogize the dead without giving offense to the living." Hon. Geo. Bancroft has been selected in place of Mr. Stanton.

Three prominent Englishmen—Lord A. Hervey, the Hon. Mr. Strutt, and Mr. Corre—have been seized by brigands in Greece. One thousand pounds ransom each was demanded, and the brigands allowed Lord A. Hervey and Mr. Strutt to go at liberty to look after the money, while Mr. Corre was held as a hostage for its payment.

The last anecdote of the late King of the Belgians is by no less person than William Cornell Jewett, who says that when he went to Europe on his "independent peace mission," he requested King Leopold to act as umpire between our Government and the rebels, and that the astute monarch replied that "he would not put his fingers between the bark and the tree."

A clergyman writing from Texas to the Postoffice Department concerning a contract for carrying the mails, says he contributed in no way to the Confederate cause, except to pray for its success, and is in doubt whether, on that account, he can conscientiously take the test oath; "but," he adds, "as my prayers were not answered, I think they should not be considered as 'aid and comfort' given to the enemy."

The New York *Journal of Commerce*, in its obituary notice of the late Gerard Hallock, states that when the paper was excluded from the mail for disloyalty by order of the Administration, at the end of August, 1861, the condition of the withdrawal of this prohibition was the retirement of Mr. Hallock. He accordingly sold out his interest, and from September, 1861, ceased to be connected in any way with the establishment.

A complimentary reception was given at the house of Mr. E. C. Cowdin, in New York, on Friday night, to Hon. Anson Burlingame, who is soon to return to China, by the way of California. Among those present were Gen. Dix, George Bancroft, Daniel S. Dickinson, Gen. N. P. Banks, Hon. Bradford R. Wood, late Minister to Denmark, John E. Ward, former Minister to China, Gen. Robert H. Pryun, late Minister to Japan, Peter Cooper, and other notabilities.

The late Rev. Samuel Fiske ("Dunn Browne"), once prayed in the pulpit "that the Lord would bless the congregation assembled, and that portion of it which was on the way to church, and those who were at home getting ready to come, and that, in his infinite patience, he would grant the benediction to those who reached the house of God just in time for that." By this eccentric method the clergyman succeeded in breaking up a bad habit, which had resisted all legitimate appeals.

Gov. Andrew signalized the close of his successful State administration by another of those incidents which marked his regard for the soldiers during the whole of the recent war. He has procured the erection of a monument, in the cemetery at Dedham, over the remains of the soldiers who died at the camp at Readville. The shaft is a plain granite one, with tablets upon which the names of the deceased volunteers are inscribed. This act touchingly recals the Governor's celebrated telegram to Baltimore concerning the bodies of the men murdered in the streets of that city on the 19th of April, 1861, and fitly crowns an administrative career full to overflowing with remarkable illustrations of the love which the retiring Governor bore toward those perilling their own lives for the sake of the national existence.

Gov. Parsons of Alabama emigrated to that State in 1835 from Herkimer county, N. Y. He was a member of the Alabama Legislature in 1859, and voted for the resolution that the election of a Republican President would be good cause for dissolving the Union, and for the appropriation of $200,000 to equip 8,000 men to carry out that resolution. During the war he supported in the Legislature the bill compelling executors, administrators, trustees, and guardians to invest in the war bonds of the State the funds and property intrusted to them. Again, in August, 1863, he introduced in the Legislature resolutions expressing the undiminished confidence of Alabama in President Davis, and tendering to him the hearty thanks of the Legislature "for his good labors in the cause of our common country."

Says the Springfield *Republican*, copying tone, temper, and the slander itself, from the N. Y. *World*:

"Chief-Justice Chase gets severely criticised for signing the petition for the pardon of young Ketchum, the biggest thief of the age. It is a singular thing for a Judge of the Supreme Court of the United States to come down from his high position to ask that the sentence of a State Court against a confessed criminal shall be annulled before its enforcement has commenced. If Ketchum had stolen five dollars, instead of five millions, should we have seen the Chief-Justice of the United States begging for his pardon? And what security does the law give for life or property if all the great criminals are to be pardoned?"

The only mistake is that Chief-Justice Chase did not petition for the pardon.

The Hon. Alexander White, a member of the Alabama Convention, delivered himself of a piece, during the session of that body, which is going the round of the Southern press as "an eloquent extract." As a specimen of what passes for eloquence—not to speak of loyalty—in that section, we reproduce a passage:

"Mr. President—The Bonnie Blue Flag no longer reflects the light of the morning sun beam, or kisses with its silken folds the genial breeze of our Southern clime. The hands that waved it along the crest of a hundred battle-fields, and the hearts that for the love they bore it so often defied danger and death, no longer rally round it. Another banner waves in triumph over its closed and prostrate folds, but proud memories and glorious recollections cluster around it. Sir, I will refrain. The South needs no eulogy. The faithful record of her achievements will encircle her brow with glory bright and enduring as the diadem that crowns the night of her cloudless skies. The scenes of Marathon and Platæa have been re-enacted in the New World without the beneficent results which flow from those battle-fields of freedom, and our country lies prostrate at the feet of the conqueror. But dearer to me is she in this hour of her humiliation than was she in the day and hour of her pride and power. Each blood-stained field, each track of devastation, each new made grave of her sons, fallen in her defence, each mutilated form of the confederate soldiers—her widow's tear, her orphan's cry—are but so many cords that bind me to her in the midst of her desolation, and draw my affections closer around my stricken country. When I raise my voice or lift my hand against her, may the thunders rive me where I stand! Though I be false in all else, I will be true to her. Though all others may prove faithless, I will be faithful still. And when, in obedience to the great command, "Dust to dust," my heart shall return to that earth from whence it sprung, it shall sink into her bosom with the proud consciousness that it never knew one beat not in unison with the honor, the interests, the glory of my country."

Ex-President Pierce was recently received into the Episcopal Church at Concord, N. H. Ex-President Buchanan has likewise mended his ways by joining the First Presbyterian Church at Lancaster, Pa.; and the Hon. John Bell, who had strong aspirations for the ex-Presidency, has followed these illustrious examples, by connecting himself with the First Presbyterian Church of Nashville, Tenn.

We find in an English paper the following extract from a private letter, written by John Stuart Mill, in reply to an invitation to take part in a meeting to be held in London to express condemnation of the massacre in Jamaica:

"I am very happy to hear that a general meeting is to be held to express the indignation due to the lawless and brutal proceedings of the Jamaica authorities, and I hope it will contribute towards obtaining, not only the disavowal and reprobation of the crimes perpetrated under pretence, or even without the pretence, of justice, but also the condign punishment of the perpetrators."

The contest for the Ohio Senatorship soon to be vacated by the expiration of Hon. John Sherman's term, is growing quite animated. The chief competitors thus far are Mr. Sherman himself and Gen. Schenck, now in the House of Representatives. The Republican papers of the State are divided. The Cincinnati *Commercial*, Cleveland *Herald*, and Republican papers of a "Conservative" tendency, generally support Sherman, while the Cincinnati *Gazette*, Cleveland *Leader*, Ashtabula *Sentinel*, and most of the radical papers oppose him and favor Schenck. Some of the latter class of papers would evidently be willing to take some third man, if it should become necessary or advisable. Hon. John A. Bingham, also of the House, is spoken of as held in reserve, and perhaps Postmaster Gen. Denison may be put in the same category. The general ground of opposition to Mr. Sherman is the alleged slowness with which he came to the support of the emancipation policy under Mr.

and to secure, the co-operation of the strongest and ablest minds, and the natural leaders of opinion, in the South."

What the law, burdened as it is with the necessity of making rules for general application, may have decided about the comparative demerits of principals and accessories in crime, is far better known to Gov. Andrew than to me; but I may at least presume to say that expediency and philosophy agree both in the justice and the wisdom of making distinction between these two sorts of men, and of expressing that distinction in our treatment of them. As to the Governor's other ideas, above expressed, my comment would be that it is very unfortunate that he has added the weight of his opinion towards the accomplishment of a prospective measure so pregnant with evil as universal amnesty; that the characters whose hostile influence he fears in the future are equally to be feared in the present; that when the "courage, talents, and will" which incite to leadership are united with an open profligacy which brings their subjects under the control of penal law, the public good may be better promoted by their banishment or incarceration than by a continuance of their leadership; and that a wise nation will demand honesty as well as strength, and good principle as well as ability, in its "leaders of public opinion;" in short, that if we distinguish the very ablest mind in the State in one who stands before the bar of justice convicted of treason, perjury, robbery, and murder, this fact should not excuse him from a felon's doom; far less should it entitle him to be chosen Governor or Senator!

Gov. Andrew has been conspicuously demonstrative in point of loyalty. He has been a prominent and active supporter of two national Administrations when assailed by rebellion, and he supported them no less when they disregarded the claims made by justice and humanity for one sixth part of the nation. As an officer of Massachusetts, he has done much for the colored people who were entitled to claim the protection of that State; as a member of the nation, he has allowed the shield of his general approval to cover a policy, on the part of two Executive magistrates, including gross injustice, both by omission and commission, to the colored race, without expression of disapproval, and with a careful separation of himself from those who *were* expressing disapproval. It may seem harsh to say that he has appeared to prize the material rather than the moral *integrity* of the nation; but, if the portion of his policy expressed in the above quotations shall be adopted, if those who have hitherto led the South are still allowed the position of leaders in State and National affairs, we shall have put in practice what Carl Schurz justly called the meanest kind of repudiation, a shirking of the claims of justice and humanity in behalf of the blacks, and especially of the black soldiers, of the South.

NORTH.

A VISIT TO GERRIT SMITH.

BUFFALO, Dec. 28, 1865.

To the Editor of the Standard:

SIR,—One of the pleasantest events of a life-time is a visit to Gerrit Smith, at *Peterboro Hall*, as an English lady here says it should be called. We spent delightfully several days there a fortnight ago. We rejoiced to find this noble philanthropist in high health, and ourselves once more in the charmed circle of his elevated thought and conversation.

Sunday afternoon we held a good anti-slavery meeting in the Methodist Church. After my lecture, Mr. Smith, who is Vice-President of the American Anti-Slavery Society, spoke with a kindled glow and most eloquent earnestness of the great danger of injustice and ingratitude to the colored man. The Constitutional Amendment cannot alone protect him in his rights. He must have the ballot. He must not be left under the feet of his old tyrants. And depend upon it, one of the bloodiest chapters in history will be enacted in the South if the negro is not to vote. This is the failure in Jamaica, where, out of a population of 400,000, only 2,500 are voters. "We have no voice," is their touching complaint. And outrage and massacre on the blacks there break out now to instruct and warn this nation in dealing with her emancipated ones.

We went to see the interesting colored family Russell. Gerrit Smith, many years ago, redeemed from Southern slavery this whole family. He paid about $4,000 for them—father, mother, and five children. Harriet (the mother), when a young girl, was given to Mrs. Smith, herself then a young girl, in Maryland, by the old English nurse of Col. Fitzhugh. She owned a family of slaves and made presents of them to the Fitzhugh children. In Mrs. Smith's absence of years from her native State, Harriet was sold to the far South with her husband and children. When Mrs. Smith's aroused conscience began to inquire for Harriet, there was difficulty to trace her.

> "The freeman, like a growing tree,
> Thrives, rooted in his place;
> The bondman, like a withered leaf,
> Flits on and leaves no trace."

After a time they were found and got safe to Peterboro. Harriet is a sensible, cheerful, nice woman, and we enjoyed her talk. She gratefully told how Mr. Smith sent for her old father in Maryland to come and live with her. When Christmas came round he was surprised not to have his accustomed Christmas drink; but he said contentedly, "I have my freedom and that is better than the old Christmas dram in slavery." For twenty-five years there has been no public sale of liquor in Peterboro. Harriet's two sons have just "come marching home" from the war. They did their part in the brave battle of Olustee.

Mr. Smith was lately in Chicago, as the newspapers have published. He called to account the Chicago *Tribune* for a false and malicious article concerning him published last June. His letter to the editor, calling for retraction, is a specimen of noble candor and magnanimity mingled with a sense of justice. We hear that the very man who wrote this wicked attack on Mr. Smith's reputation (his character, thank God, is safe with Him, and nothing can ever take that away) is one whom Mr. Smith helped with money years ago. As everybody knows, his marvellous benevolence is like the stars of heaven, or the sands of the sea—cannot be numbered. It is incredible any decent journal could lend itself to either ignorance or affectation in such atrocious calumnies as this article contains on one of the purest patriots and most eminent benefactors our country knows. What other American gave his only son to our army to serve in the war without a cent of pay from Government? Gerrit Smith did this. He contributed thousands and thousands of dollars to the support of soldiers' wives and children, and bounties while the war lasted. He sent one thousand dollars out of the one hundred thousand in the good ship Griswold to the relief of our heroic, starving Lancashire friends. In these and all other ways he aided greatly to crush the slaveholders rebellion and uphold the Government. The Chicago *Tribune* might have learned something of the generous heart and hand ever seeking to pour itself out in blessing humanity, by Mr. Smith's unselfish activities while in its own city. He added to his labor to bring the *Tribune* to speak with a civil and truthful tongue, a visit to the Washingtonian Home, and a public speech in behalf of temperance on a Sunday evening, before an immense audience gathered to hear him. On Tuesday following, another on negro voting—the condition of the nation's salvation.

To be in that beautiful Peterboro' home, surrounded by every comfort, elegance, and luxury that taste and wealth can conscientiously enjoy; to feel the temptation to ease and indulgence, and then see the refined temperance, the wonderful industry of Gerrit Smith; how, rising at dawn, every hour is consecrated to some holy work; how faithfully he keeps abreast with the world's foremost march in knowledge, truth, love, and goodness, neglecting no social interest of his little Peterboro—the school, the Bible class, the church, the widow, the fatherless, the sick, the poor, the lame—to know the personal effort he gives to such varied objects as appeal to him—or more likely he can say in Scripture phrase, "The cause I knew not, I searched not"—impressed one as no report can possibly do. The union of wealth of purse and wealth of soul makes Gerrit Smith such a man as Theodore Parker loved to meet—"A man who makes his money serve as a ladder towards heaven whereon he and his fellow creatures can climb up to higher heights of humanity. The strong man lifting up the weak."

SALLIE HOLLEY.

THE HIGH-TONED.—We had, says a correspondent, a glimpse of the old days in a street car incident, yesterday. One of the chivalry on entering a car found a negro in it, and ordered him to get out. The colored man quietly refused. The chivalry grew wrathful, drew a pistol, and swore he would blow the nigger's brains out. The colored man was not frightened, and the end was that the gasconading chivalry got out himself.

SENTIMENTS OF PENNSYLVANIA ABOLITIONISTS.

WHEREAS, Three-fourths of the loyal States have ratified the Constitutional Amendment, abolishing slavery; and the Secretary of State of the United States has officially announced that Slavery has no longer a legal existence in this Nation; therefore

Resolved, That we hail this grand triumph of our cause with profound joy and gratitude to God who has wrought out so great a deliverance for the millions of slaves in our land.

Whereas, The spirit of slavery against which this Society has warred for thirty years, still exists, and plainly manifests itself in the legislative action and in the press of the South, as well as in the personal cruelty practised by the recent slave-masters upon their victims; and

Whereas, We believe that the only way of securing the practical effect of the Constitutional Amendment, and protecting the personal liberty of the black man in the South, is to put the ballot into his hand; therefore

Resolved, That we will now address ourselves to the completion of our work, by advocating and demanding, in the name of justice and humanity, that in the reconstruction of Southern State governments, suffrage shall be bestowed *without distinction of color*; that the enfranchised slave may thus be invested with sufficient political freedom to protect his personal freedom.

The foregoing resolutions were unanimously adopted at an unusually full meeting of the Executive Committee of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, held on the 3d instant.

JAMES MOTT, Chairman.

B. C. BACON, Secretary.

LABOR CONTRACTS IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

GEN. SAXTON, heretofore known as a faithful friend of the blacks, is quoted in the *Herald* as the author of the following form of contract between the freedmen and the planters. Whoever proposed it, or agrees to it, the contract is one-sided, unjust to the negro, and based upon ideas belonging to a slave system. We trust it may prove that Gen. Saxton in assenting to it acted under orders, and not on his own convictions. But in neither case can his action be excused.

FORM OF CONTRACT.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, DARLINGTON DISTRICT.

Articles of agreement between—— ——and—— ——, freedmen and women, whose names are hereinto attached:

First—The said servants agree to hire their time as laborers on the plantation of—— ——— from January 1, 1866, to January 1, 1867; to conduct themselves faithfully, honestly, civilly, and diligently to perform all labor on said plantation, or such as may be connected therewith, that may be required by the said—— —— or his agent; and to keep no poultry, dogs or stock of any kind, except as hereinafter specified; and without the written consent of the proprietor or his agent to keep no fire-arms or deadly weapon, no ardent spirits, nor introduce or invite visitors, nor leave the premises.

Second—The said servants agree to perform the daily tasks hitherto usually allotted on said plantation, to wit:—One hundred and twenty-five to one hundred and fifty rails; cutting grain, three to six acres; ditching and banking, three hundred to six hundred feet; hoeing cotton, seventy to three hundred rows, an acre long; corn, four thousand to seven thousand hills. In all cases where tasks cannot be assigned, they agree to labor diligently ten hours a day.

Third—For every day's labor lost, by absence, refusal or neglect to perform the daily task, said servants shall forfeit fifty cents. If absent voluntarily, or without leave, two dollars a day; if absent more than one day, without leave, to be subject to dismissal from the plantation and forfeiture of share in the crop. All such fines and forfeitures shall enure to the benefit of the employer and employés in proportion to their relative shares.

Fourth—Said servants agree to take good care of all utensils, tools and implements, committed to their charge, and to pay for the same if injured or destroyed; also, to be kind and gentle to all work animals under their charge, and to pay for any injury which they may sustain while in their hands.

Fifth—They stipulate to keep their houses, lots and persons in neat condition, and subject to the inspection of the employer or his agent at any time.

Sixth—They agree to furnish from their number a nurse for the sick; also, stock-minder and foreman, to be selected by the employer. They agree to be directed in their labor by the foreman, to obey his orders and that he shall report all absences, neglects, refusal to work, or disorderly conduct to the employer.

Seventh—The said employer agrees to treat his hirelings with justice and kindness; to furnish each family with quarters on his plantation, with one-fourth of an acre of land for a garden, and the privilege of getting firewood from some portion of the premises, to be indicated by the employer, and to divide the crop with them in the following proportions, viz:—To the hirelings one-third of the corn, potatoes and peas gathered and prepared for market, and one-third net proceeds of the ginned cotton, or its market value at the end of the year, and when desired, to furnish the usual bread and meat rations, to be accounted for at the market price out of their share of the crop.

Eighth—Said employer agrees to furnish animals and to feed them; also waggons, carts, plantation implements, etc., such as cannot be made by the laborers on the plantation.

Ninth—All violations of the terms of this contract, or of the rules and regulations of the employer, may be punished by dismissal from the plantation, with forfeiture of his or her share of the crop or wages, as the case may be; but the employer shall pay said parties at the rate of four dollars a month for full hands, deducting therefrom advances made.

Tenth—The employer or his agent shall keep a book in which shall be entered all advances made by him, and fines and forfeitures for lost time or any cause, which book shall be received as evidence in same manner as merchants' books are now received in courts of justice, and shall have a right to deduct from the share of each laborer all his or her fines and forfeitures; also all advances made by him.

Eleventh—The laborers shall not sell any agricultural product to any person whatever without the written consent of the employer.

Twelfth—The laborers shall commence work at sunrise, and be allowed from one to three hours each day for their meals, according to the season of the year. In cases where parties prefer to contract for wages in lieu of a part of the crop, it will be competent for them to do so, in which case the committee suggest a scale of prices according to quality of hands, ranging from forty dollars to one hundred and twenty dollars a year.

COLORED MEN'S CELEBRATION OF NEW YEAR'S DAY IN RICHMOND.—On New Year's day four thousand freedmen met in the African Church in Richmond to do honor to the memory of the late President Lincoln and commemorate the anniversary of the day, three years since, when the fifteenth President of the United States, by a memorable proclamation, emancipated four millions of bondmen, and dedicated himself to posterity as the exemplar statesman of his age and time. From an early hour the church was crowded, and, the meeting being organized, prayer was offered by a colored minister and a speech made by Mr. John Oliver of Boston, a colored man, who has been a resident of our city for eighteen years. He is reported to have spoken with freedom, earnestness and good sense to the acceptance of all who heard him. The address bore on the future of the negro race. An abstract says:

"The colored men were told that they must remember when the war began it was not the intention of the Government to free them. The Government were compelled to this result, and adopted the policy of emancipation only to insure the perpetuity of the Constitution, and the integrity of the union of all the States. Therefore, knowing and appreciating this cardinal fact, the freedmen everywhere must, of necessity, prepare to become immediately a self-sustaining race. To this end they must at once set about becoming cultivators of the soil, and build up for themselves permanent and solid homes, and initiate this new life by making such contracts with the late slaveholders as could be carried out in a spirit of equity and common justice. Thus they would gradually be educating themselves, through the medium of honest toil, to control their own interests in the several relations of life, among which he enumerated their claims upon a free school system which they were now at liberty to establish and maintain for themselves, thus perfecting the generations of their race yet to come in morals, science, and religion. Finally, the speaker held that the colored people, being ultimately successful in all these laudable aspirations and undertakings, they would be prepared to show the country and the world that they, as a freedom made race, were equal to the full and unrestricted enjoyment of to them that final boon and glory, and consummation—one law for all through the suffrage."

The accomplished band of the Twenty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteers supplied the music.

NEGRO DECLARATION OF RIGHTS.—The officers of the Equal Rights League (colored) at Washington, N. C., have published an address disclaiming secresy in their organization. They say that the obejct of their league is to secure by political and moral means, so far as may be, the repeal of all laws and parts of laws, state and national, that make distinctions on account of color. "We therefore aspire to the condition and privileges of freemen. Is not this a natural aspiration? Is it not dictated by self-respect? We ask an opportunity to show that we are worthy to be free, and propose to attain the condition and privileges of freemen, by becoming intelligent, by industry, by virtue, by piety. If our object is noble and one worthy of freemen, then why are not the means proposed for attaining it moral and peaceful? We disclaim the remotest intention to interfere in any manner, by violence. Does any suggest insurrection? We frown upon him." The address closes: "We do pledge ourselves to maintain good order. Our arms and our lives, if necessary, are at the service of the Government to quell and crush insurrection. Having done this, we shall demand of the lawful authority, protection for our property, and schools, presses, and churches."

ANNIVERSARY OF EMANCIPATION.

MEETING OF COLORED CITIZENS IN TREMONT TEMPLE, BOSTON, JAN. 1, 1866.

From the Boston Journal.

THE anniversary of the Act of Emancipation was celebrated yesterday by a meeting in Tremont Temple, afternoon and evening. Mr. Lewis Hayden presided. After reading of the Scriptures by Rev. E. N. Kirk, D.D., Rev. Geo. H. Washington offered prayer, and the hymn, "Blow ye the trumpet, blow," was sung by the congregation. The Proclamation of Emancipation issued by the late President Lincoln, Jan. 1, 1863, was read by Mr. S. Baldwin Smith.

Mr. Richard Greenough offered the following preamble and resolutions:

Whereas, It has pleased the great I AM again to show to the nations of the earth that he holds the reins of the Universe in his hands, and has fixed the bounds of men, beyond which they cannot pass; and whereas, the United States of America, from its organization until the year of grace, 1863, did make merchandise and "slaves of souls of men;" and whereas, the Almighty God, our Father, to carry out his purposes, did harden the hearts and stiffen the necks of those traitors and men then in rebellion against the best Government to them and the objects they sought (inasmuch as in their State governments the nation justified and maintained them in the holding of slaves); and whereas, it doth appear, through the willingness hitherto of the North to sustain such relation, it is therefore manifest that unto God and Him alone belongs all the glory and adoration for the freedom of our land and country; therefore

Resolved, That we devoutly and gratefully recognize the outstretched arm of the Great Deliverer in bringing this people out of the house of bondage toward the Promised Land.

Resolved, That, among human agencies, our thanks are due and are hereby cordially given to his Excellency Gov. Andrew, and to the Massachusetts delegation in Congress, for their fidelity to our cause during the long years of civil war for the abolition of slavery.

Resolved, That we here record our special gratitude and thanks to Senator Sumner and his sculptor, Henry Wilson, not only for what they have done in helping to break the chains of slavery, but for their brave and persistent efforts to endow one race with all the political rights of citizens of the United States.

ADDRESS BY DR. KIRK.

Rev. Dr. Kirk being introduced, said that we had little comprehension of the events before us to-day. It is God's work. We have often denied his justice, and He has been rebuking us for it. They had come together as citizens of a country that God had made free. Our colored fellow-citizens had crossed the Red Sea. It was true that the wilderness was before them, that the hatred of the negro at the South was greater than it had ever been. He believed that there the feeling was now that the black man must be exterminated. He could not congratulate his colored fellow-citizens that they had entered the Land of Promise—they were indeed in the wilderness—but Egypt was behind them and Canaan before them. The Government of the United States had ceased to be their enemy; the doctrine of tyranny was now a political heresy in the Republic; the law no more writes "chattel" on the black man's brow; the Constitution, the laws, the Government, the army, are all on the black man's side—and the black man is a part of the army; the sympathy of the civilized world is coming over strongly in favor of the black man. The country is now a Christian democracy. The whole country is now to come under the power of free institutions. It had been one of his strongest desires to see the great plantations of the South split up. The black man and the white man must occupy small farms down there, whether the chivalry like it or not. (Applause.) It is necessary, however, that we should form a correct public opinion on vital points. He believed that we should hold the Southern States where the war has placed them until they do right. (Applause.) Let us make them believe that the North is in earnest. We are never going to be tricked again. If need be, we are ready to fight it all over again (cries of "Good! good" and applause); but when they are ready to do what is right, we shall be ready and happy to meet them. The citizenship of the negro must be acknowledged; the killing-off process must cease. The country must be as serious in peace as it was in war. If any man in this country is to be deprived of the right of suffrage, it must not be on account of the color of his skin. In conclusion, the speaker said that Congress is bound to secure to humanity and the country the fruits of the war gained by the expenditure of so much blood and treasure—the fruits of victory given to us for the glory of God and the welfare of all mankind, and remarked further that the Freedmen's Bureau, of the workings of which he (the speaker) knew something, should be maintained and made to touch everywhere.

ADDRESS BY WM. WELLS BROWN.

Mr. Wm. Wells Brown said, in reference to the hatred of the negro referred to by the previous speaker, that in availing itself of the services of the black man in the army, the Government pledged itself to protect the black man. The black man's defence now was the ballot, and any action which might go to deprive him of it would be nothing less than desertion. The whites at the South were forming combinations against the negro, as was well known, and the colored race had a right to demand of the Government the fulfilment of its pledge. The colored man had used the bayonet in the suppression of one rebellion, and he had the right to the privilege of the ballot for the prevention of another rebellion. He did not expect much from President Johnson. President Johnson sprang from the poor whites—he (the speaker) sprang from the rich whites—and there was always an enmity between them. He did not suppose that Mr. Johnson desired slavery as it was eight or nine years ago, but feared that he would scarcely take cognizance of the actual rights of the negro as in all respects entitled to the privileges of citizenship.

ADDRESS OF C. L. REMOND.

Mr. C. L. Remond being called for, said that he was one of those who were not satisfied with the present status of the colored man in this country. He did not like to observe the feeling of satisfaction which apparently prevailed with what had been done. It was no time to stop at a fragmentary liberty for the black man. He referred to the position occupied by the negro in Connecticut, where he was disfranchised at this day. It was a shame to the Abolitionists that it was so. In Boston, too, the black man's character for honesty and ability stood higher among pro-slavery men than with Abolitionists. It was a singular fact, but a fact nevertheless, although he could not say exactly why it was. He could imagine no cause more deplorable than that of the black race at the South, with extermination staring them in the face. He would claim no rights for the black man now that he had not always claimed. He was a coward, a hypocrite and a liar who dared assert that, other things being equal, the black man was not equal to him. He hoped to live to see slavery completely abolished at the South, and prejudice uprooted in Massachusetts, if nowhere else. President Johnson had kept the promise to the ear and broken it to the heart of the colored race; and those who had upheld him in his equivocating course might live to be sorry for it, and perhaps shed tears over its results.

REMARKS OF REV. J. D. FULTON.

Rev. J. D. Fulton being introduced, advocated the extension of the right of suffrage to the colored race on the broad ground of their manhood. In relation to the course pursued by President Johnson, he remarked that theories molded governments, and said that if Andrew Johnson was damned in history, it would be simply because of his attempt to thrust Alabama as a State upon the Union when she had been recreant to every trust reposed in her. Andrew Johnson might be tall, but God was taller. Andrew Johnson might be strong, but he was not almighty. When he tells Congressmen that he will give away no more offices until Congressmen shall bow the knee to Baal, he does not know the American people. He wished his colored brothers well, and that the time might soon come when the negro would have recognized rights in this land.

The meeting then adjourned to 7½ o'clock in the evening.

EVENING SESSION.

The meeting was called to order by the President, and prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. McKay, after which a short poem was read by Mr. William Wells Brown.

REMARKS OF MR. C. C. COFFIN.

Mr. C. C. Coffin being introduced, referred to the necessity of securing now by irreversible guaranties the principles which underlie our Constitution. He related many thrilling and touching incidents of the war. We have had our days of darkness, he said—we have had our days of justice too, when God heard and answered our prayer. Shall we now forget the promises which, in the day when we needed their services, we held out to the colored man? We are asked to meet fraternally these reconstructed unrepentant white men of the South and shake hands with them over the ballot-box. But while we are asked to do this let us remember that these are the words we are yet to hear at the judgment day: "I was ahungered and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty and ye gave me no drink; I was a stranger and ye took me not in; naked, and ye clothed me not; sick and in prison, and ye visited me not." The principles of free government are found in the words of the Declaration of Independence, "that all men are created equal." In the great moral contest of the ballot-box before us, we need the heroism and devotion of those heroes of the bayonet who have fought our battles and suffered and sacrificed so much during the last four years. We must have some charity for the South, it is true, but since they have stayed out of the Union for four years, what matter if they stay out a little longer? An officer of the army, occupying high position, on returning from a tour of inspection at the South, was asked how much Union feeling, how much loyalty to the Government, he had found. "As much Christianity as there is in hell," was his reply. Let us be firm to do the right, and forget not justice.

ADDRESS OF WENDELL PHILLIPS.

Wendell Phillips was introduced, and was received with great enthusiasm by the audience. Mr. Phillips said that it was fitting that the colored race should rejoice at the events which this day brought to mind. He believed that this very year completed the century since the attempt was first made in the British courts to establish the principle that the negro had rights. The movement in behalf of the negro, which had exercised the genius and the ability of some of the most distinguished minds for a hundred years, had culminated in the British Isles in allowing to the black man the largest liberty, and in this country in recognizing the legal freedom of the slave. This was almost enough to have been accomplished in a century. But his idea to-day was that the good ship of the anti-slavery cause had only escaped the perilous storms of two-thirds of its passage, but had not yet entered port. It was not yet time for the festival and the harbor parting. But, like St. Paul, at the Three Taverns, he "thanked God and took courage." He rejoiced to stand by the side of his friend, the previous speaker, in the momentous struggle before us. So much had we shown the world, that Democracy can fight; we have now to show whether Democracy can govern—whether what has been earned on the battle-field is to be lost in the maelstrom of politics—whether we who have stayed at home in comfortable houses are to be found worthy heirs of the victories won by those whose heroism their friend had described. Was it for an idea three-quarters rebel and one-quarter Union that these boys gave their lives? In yonder Senate-house at Washington, the plot is maturing, and a hundred days will see it ripen, which shall place this emancipated race again in the uncontrolled hands of their white masters. The emblem of reconstructed South Carolina is a lash, as it was before. He referred to the late report made to the Board of Trade and adopted by that body with regard to the condition of the freedmen at the South and the remedy proposed for Southern disorganization. The poison of the present day is not that South Carolina believes in a system of compulsory labor, but that Boston merchants, so far as it appears, advocate it also. Even the giant of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, has bowed to the influences at work, and urges the speedy readmission of the Southern States. The President, in attempting to lecture colored citizens, had reached the height of impudence. But he believed that the President had been outdone when Alabama, in the person of Gov. Parsons, led here by Mr. Beecher, and advocating doctrines and principles which Massachusetts utterly repudiates, asked Massachusetts to lend her three millions of dollars to carry out her measures of injustice. The Governor went out to these merchants of Boston who advocate "a stringent vagrant law"—and they didn't lend him a dollar. For his own part, Mr. Phillips said, he was not for vengeance. He did not believe that Jeff. Davis could have justice in this world. But did Grant conquer Lee? It is the principle of the law of nations that the conquerors shall hold the government of the conquered until the questions raised by the war shall be settled. South Carolina owes to the Union a debt of three thousand millions and a half of money and half a million of lives, and this debt means, the doors of the Union closed and double-locked until the questions at issue shall be settled by the conquerors. How were we to deal with the white people of the South? Follow them as Grant followed Lee. He would not annihilate them, but flank them—he proposed to "fight it out on that line," if it took a generation. He would place four million of black men on their feet, each with a ballot in his right hand—Corps No. 1, under Maj.-Gen. Justice. He would have emigration, with the Federal power exercising such a pressure that a Northern man, with the Declaration of Independence printed on his shirt bosom, might walk unmolested anywhere in the Southern country—Corps No. 2, under Maj.-Gen. Numbers. He would have a capital, so managed and so employed that by its means Massachusetts should be wedded to the Gulf of Mexico—Corps No. 3, under Maj.-Gen. Political Economy. Mr. Phillips concluded with an eloquent peroration, and sat down amid great applause.

The Chairman stated that Mr. Henry Wilson, who had been announced to speak, was so ill that he was unable to appear.

Hon. J. M. S. Williams, of Cambridge, was then introduced, and spoke earnestly in regard to the course which had been pursued by President Johnson, and its results in a business point of view, referring particularly to the need of a harvest of cotton, which we never should have until we did justice to the negro, but expressing a more hopeful view of the condition of our national affairs than the previous speaker, believing that there would be no difference between Congress and the President.

Mr. Phillips said that if the gentleman did not agree with him, he did with the gentleman. He admired his sound practical views. So far as Congress and the President were concerned, they would be like a certain husband and wife, who were both one, but he was the one. Congress and the President might be one in sentiment, but the President was that one. (Laughter and applause.)

Capt. Crocker, late of the army, spoke briefly, and letters were read from Hon. Charles Sumner and Mr. Geo. T. Downing, the delegate chosen at the late convention in this city to represent the interests of the colored people of New England before Congress. The following is the

LETTER FROM CHARLES SUMNER.

WASHINGTON, 24th December, 1865.

DEAR SIR: I shall not be able to be present at your proposed Celebration, but I send you my sympathies and best wishes.

As yet the battle is only *half won*. Until all Black Laws are abolished, we must continue in the field, fighting as before. To this cause I dedicate myself anew, and shall not cease my exertions except with the final victory.

It is idle—very idle—to say that Liberty is secured so long as an infamous Code is allowed to exist, which gives to one race Oligarchical privileges, and denies to the other all the essential safeguards of citizenship. Here, again, Massachusetts must lead in declaring the duty of the National Government.

Believe me, my dear sir, faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

WM. WELLS BROWN, Esq.

The Doxology was then sung, and the meeting adjourned.

LITERARY.

The "Correspondence de S. M. Napoleon I." does not pay its expenses. To prevent the publication being discontinued, the Emperor has guaranteed the expenses, by placing the necessary funds at the disposal of Prince Napoleon, under whose direction the work is brought out.

The *Boudoir*, a lady's newspaper, published in New York, has a leader this week on "The Current Fashions as Displayed in Beecher's Church!" This is a new and odd kind of power which Mr. Beecher's society is now exercising. Indeed, the union of the great reformer with Madame Demorest cannot fail to give him the only remaining element of influence he needed.

Mr. Conway writes to the *Commonwealth* that "Browning's new poem will not be published yet for a full year. It is a vast work—twelve books, to be published in two volumes, each larger than Aurora Leigh."

The *North American Review*, in noticing Major Nichols' "Story of the Great March," says Gen. Sherman seems to have acted as sort of general aid-de-camp to Maj. Nichols! Some of the Major's friends will see where the laugh comes in.

The following is a statement of the number of works, in different departments, which bear the imprint of the Harpers.

	Works.	Vols.	Orig.	Rept.
History and Biography	329	585	158	171
Travel and Adventure	130	187	73	57
Theology and Religion	120	167	68	52
Educational	156	165	124	32
Art, Science, Medicine	96	110	46	50
Dictionaries, Gazetteers	28	34	23	5
General Literature	690	780	230	460
Totals	1,540	2,028	722	827

The Louisville publishers having come to the conclusion that the issue of seven daily papers per week involved a greater amount of both mental and physical labor, and of wear and tear of body and mind, than mortals could be expected to stand for more than ten years on a stretch, have wisely determined hereafter to issue only six papers each week. The *Journal* will suspend its Sunday issue; the *Courier* will not begin its Sunday paper, and the *Democrat* will suspend its Monday issue, printing their edition on Sunday morning, as before the war.

MURDER OF FREEDMEN IN NORTH CAROLINA.—We learn by a gentleman just from Newbern that cases of inhuman outrage toward freedmen continue to occur in North Carolina, the virus of the old slave system yet lingering in some neighborhoods. Not long since some white men in Pitt county perpetrated an unmentionable crime upon a negro and then stove in his head, killing him. They were arrested and taken to Little Washington, where, to use our informant's expression, "they put a blanket over the jailor's head and walked off," and that was the last of it, although the case was brought to the attention of the Freedmen's Bureau. On the 27th of December another diabolical outrage was perpetrated near Pactolus, in the same county. Two negro boys were enticed into a swamp by a villainous white man, who fired upon them with a gun, blowing the head of one to pieces and filling one side of the face of the other with shot. Supposing that he had killed both, the murderer rode off, and the boy who was wounded made his way out of the swamp and related the circumstances to our informant, who on going to the swamp found the body of the other lad in the condition stated. The wounded boy says he could recognise the murderer if he saw him, and from the description he gave of him suspicion rests on a noted character in the neighborhood. The local authorities would not do anything about the matter, and the next day the Massachusetts gentleman proceeded to Goldsboro, forty miles distant, and laid the facts before Col. Clapp, the Assistant Superintendent of Freedmen in North Carolina, who did not manifest any intention of bringing the murderer to justice, and up to the time of his leaving Newbern no such action had been taken.—*Boston Journal.*

AN APPEAL FROM THE COLORED PEOPLE OF NEW ENGLAND.

THE colored people of New England, in convention assembled, resolved to have a colored delegation at Washington to endeavor to induce Congress to adopt as its policy, that the color of a man shall not be a qualification or a disqualification in deciding as to his enjoying privileges, immunities, and rights under the government to which he owes allegiance, and from which it is his right to demand protection; and also to endeavor to induce Congress to protect the black loyalists of the South from outrage and murder at the hands of their former owners, who now feel much embittered against them because of their assistance to the Union cause in the late Rebellion.

Allow us to state briefly the considerations which urge the desire to have at Washington a delegation of colored men. Most of the representatives sent there do not know the worth, intelligence, and refinement existing among large classes of the colored people; they have not discriminated in judging them; they have judged all by the same standard, and that a low one; therefore it is desirable to have a delegated representation at Washington of the intelligence, character, and refinement to be found among the colored people. All admit the effect of an honest, earnest, *personal* appeal. Our friends in Congress have all the varied interests of the nation on their minds; the proposed delegation would be there on a special mission. It would show that the colored people feel aggrieved; that they are hopefully determined. The delegation could express the feelings of the colored people; could give information which could not be so readily and effectually obtained from any other source; they would have an opportunity to become versed and generally better informed on matters relating to their people and country; and be thus benefitted. Its bureau would be the place to which all information relating to the freedmen (they are not free men) and all colored persons may be sent and compiled for reference.

The fact of having such a delegation at Washington would attract attention; would disseminate intelligence; would stimulate more generally the colored people; all of which would have its legitimate, profitable effect on society in general. These are some of the reasons why we think you should respond to our appeal. The colored man is to remain in your midst. Is it not, then, your interest to have him elevated, refined, and moral? This will tend thereto. Until the colored man is made equal before the law, an earnest, unceasing agitation will be pressed, which will necessarily hamper and obstruct the wheels of progress in every avenue of material prosperity in the land, which will be unclogged only when justice is done in the matter. Why not do immediately what must inevitably be done, that the prosperity of the nation may the sooner have a free course? We are limited in our means; but we are trying to help ourselves. Help those who are helping themselves. Duty, reparation, gratitude, join in the appeal. You are rich, we are poor; you as a class have had the benefit of our unrequited toil; you are of the class who have outraged us, oppressed, enslaved us. Of whom else than to such of this class as now see the errors of the past should we go, and expect sympathy and aid?

He is considered the greatest friend who lays down his life for a friend; then notice the Christ-like character, the sublime emotion, which prompted the colored man voluntarily to lay down his life for his enemy, for one who has abused and despised and ill-treated him! Is this not a true picture of the colored man in connection with his country and the late war? Generously reward the sacrifice.

To carry out this design properly will take considerable means; the expense of establishing and carrying on a bureau must necessarily be large; but we see the need of such, and it must be done. We appeal to you personally to respond.

Those who intend responding to this appeal will see the necessity of doing so at their earliest convenience.

The undersigned persons have been appointed to receive subscriptions.

REV. L. A. GRIMES, Boston.
LEWIS HAYDEN, "
GEO. L. RUFFIN, "
J. V. DEGRASSE, M.D., "
M. R. DEMORTIE, "
T. W. STEAMBURG, "
E. M. BANNISTER, "
J. J. SMITH, "
JAS. G. WILSON, New Bedford.
A. G. BOURDAIN, JR., "
H. D. HUDSON, "
WM. WELLS BROWN, Cambridgeport.
MR. SIMMONDS, Chelsea.
C. L. REMOND, Reading.
WM. BROWN, Worcester.
MR. MONTAGUE, Springfield.
RANSOM PARKER, Providence, R. I.
GEORGE HENRY, "
J. T. WAUGH, "
JAS. JEFFERSON, "
MR. GREEN, "
SILAS DICKERSON, Newport, R. I.
MR. VALENTINE, "
REV. PETER ROSS, Hartford.
PETER NOTT, "
E. FREEMAN, "
R. J. COWES, New Haven.
E. P. TALBOT, Portland, Me.
J. T. HASLEY, "
D. R. GORDON, Norwich, Conn.
GEO. HENRY, Pawtucket, R. I.

M. R. DEMORTIE Secretary,
13 Anderson Street, Boston.

Boston, Dec. 20, 1865.

NEGRO CONVENTION IN MARYLAND.—The State Colored Convention of Maryland met at Baltimore on Friday, and passed resolutions to solicit contributions and rebuild seven colored churches in the State, which were burned by rebels and malicious persons. Resolutions regarding the death of President Lincoln were also passed, including the following:

"Resolved, That the exalted public and private character of the late President; his freedom from selfish ambition; his fear of God and devotion to the eternal principles of liberty and justice; his unsurpassed wisdom and humanity, which he evinced in carrying out the principles of republican government, will cause his memory to be cherished with love and reverence until the end of time."

An advisory address to the colored citizens of Maryland was adopted, containing the following:

"We would therefore advise you, first, to feel that you are free and dependent upon yourselves for support. Second, we advise you to be men of virtuous habits, disdaining to do anything beneath the dignity of men. Third, we advise you to be industrious in all the pursuits of life, purchase property and become men of wealth, owning the soil; for no class of men are so independent as farmers. Fourth, we advise you to educate your children, and give them trades, thereby making them equal for any position in life, for if ever we are raised to the elevated summit in life for which we strive, it must be done by our own industry and exertion. No one can do it for us. Fifth, we advise you to use every exertion to contradict the predictions of your enemies, which were uttered previous to the emancipation of the States, that if the slaves were freed they would become a pest to society and paupers dependent on public charities."

FREEDMEN'S AFFAIRS.—Col. Brown, the Assistant Commissioner of the Freedmen's Bureau for the State of Virginia, has just rendered to Gen. Howard a report of his operations since his appointment on the 15th of June last, in which he states that of seventy thousand freedmen collected during the war about Norfolk, Fortress Monroe, and Yorktown, from eight to ten thousand enlisted in the Union army. The Assistant Commissioner also says that the extraordinary eagerness of freedmen for the advantages of schools has been met as far as the resources of the Bureau and the charitable zeal of its friends abroad would allow, and that at present there are about 11,500 colored children receiving the benefits of education. The irritation existing between the whites and the freedmen immediately after the cessation of hostilities, has greatly abated, and instances of personal violence are becoming more rare. Col. B. states that it is impossible for employers to give all the laborers there sufficient wages for their support, and thinks the evil cannot be remedied without the emigration from the State of at least fifty thousand freedmen. During the month of October last, seven thousand six hundred and six rations per day were issued to destitute freedmen, this number being reduced thirty per cent. from the previous month. The number of freedmen at present under medical treatment is seven hundred. Of the property held by the Bureau since its establishment, fifty-six thousand acres are still in its possession. The Commissioner states that the crops have not as yet been fully harvested, but are believed to be satisfactory throughout the State.

RATIONS TO THE DESTITUTE IN ALABAMA.—Gen. Swayne, Commissioner of Freedmen for Alabama, writes that he succe

Miscellaneous Department.

HERMIONE; OR, DIFFERENCES ADJUSTED.

BY ROBERT BUCHANAN.

WHEREVER I wander, up and about,
This is the puzzle I can't make out—
Because I care little for books, no doubt:

I have a wife and she is wise,
Deep in philosophy, strong in Greek:
Spectacles shadow her pretty eyes,
Coteries rustle to hear her speak;
She writes a little—for love, not fame;
Has published a book with a dreary name;
And yet (God bless her!) is mild and meek.
And how I happened to woo and wed
A wife so pretty and wise withal
Is part of the puzzle that fills my head—
Plagues me at daytime, racks me in bed,
Haunts me and makes me appear so small.
The only answer that I can see
Is—Icould not have married Hermione
(That is her fine, wise name), but she
Stooped in her wisdom and married *me*.

For: I am a fellow of no degree,
Given to romping and jollity;
The Latin they thrashed into me at school
The world and its fights have thrashed away:
At figures alone I am no fool,
And in City circles I say my say.
But I am a dunce at twenty-nine,
And the kind of study that I think fine
Is a chapter of Dickens, a sheet of the *Times*,
When I lounge, after work, in my easy chair;
Punch for humor, and Praed for rhymes,
And the butterfly *mots* blown here and there
By the idle breath of the social air.

A little French is my only gift,
Wherewith at times I can make a shift,
Guessing at meanings to flutter over
A filagree tale in a paper cover.

Hermione, my Hermione!
What could your wisdom perceive in me?
And Hermione, my Hermione!
How does it happen at all that we
Love one another so utterly?
Well, I have a bright-eyed boy of two,
A darling who cries with lung and tongue, about
As fine a fellow, I swear to you,
As ever poet of sentiment sung about!
And my lady-wife with the serious eyes
Brightens and lightens when he is nigh,
And looks, although she is deep and wise,
As foolish and happy as he or I!
And I have the courage just then, you see,
To kiss the lips of Hermione—
Those learned lips that the learned praise—
And to clasp her close as in sillier days;
To talk and joke in a frolic vein,
To tell her my stories of things and men;
And it never strikes me that I'm profane,
For she laughs, and blushes, and kisses again,
And presto! fly goes her wisdom then!
For Boy claps hands, and is up on her breast,
Roaring to see her so bright with mirth,
And I know she deems me (O the jest!)
The cleverest fellow on all the earth!

And Hermione, my Hermione,
Nurses her boy and defers to me;
Does not seem to see I'm small—
Even to think me a dunce at all!
And wherever I wander, up and about,
Here is the puzzle I can't make out—
That Hermione, my Hermione,
In spite of her Greek and philosophy,
When sporting at night with her boy and me,
Seems sweeter and wiser, I assever—
Sweeter and wiser, and far more clever,
And makes me feel more foolish than ever,
Through her childish, girlish, joyous grace,
And the silly pride in her learned face!

That is the puzzle I can't make out—
Because I care little for books, no doubt;
But the puzzle is pleasant, I know not why,
For, whenever I think of it, night or morn,
I thank my God she is wise, and I
The happiest fool that ever was born!

—*The Argosy.*

BOOK TALK.

From the Boston Post.

WE know that it is a maxim with one of our best-known publishing houses, upon any new book being issued by them, never to count upon any return beyond the expenses, and they cannot be sure that a book, combining what good judges would call merit and popularity, will even cover those. Of course there are qualifying circumstances in individual cases. Little, Brown, & Co. will tell you with tolerable accuracy what the sale of a new volume of Bancroft would be. Ticknor & Fields will tell you that such a one of their authorial staff is good for so many thousand copies at once, yet the coming fact may belie their promises, and Emerson's or Saxe's next volume may snow a sad decrease of popularity, or again an increase of sales. The case where an author on repeated issues will have equal sales is exceptional, and still more exceptional where he grows in favor. Adventitious circumstances too may prefigure profit from a book. Let the Lieutenant-General offer a treatise or a volume of poems to the publishers, and they will bid for it, though it be poorer stuff than anything on their list. A popular furor upon any subject will sell a large edition, that might remain on the shelves, issued five years later, or earlier. These are the signs publishers watch for, and yet for all these, and the chance hits of some new venture, publishing as a business, as one of the British masters of it, Chambers, says, is one of the most hazardous of any. It is only skill, insight, and more or less good luck that makes its way in the end. Continual success renders the way easier, doubtless; and an established reputation becomes an integral part of the capital. It has been reckoned that in the British book mart Murray's name on the title added one-third to the orders for it at the start. There are those of our Boston publishers, whose standing orders will run off an edition of anything. The problem, however, is not solved when that eminence is attained. The thousands of retail dealers all over the country are so many fingers upon the public pulse, and they are very sure to find out when it is time to cancel standing orders; and these admonitions are very potent advisers to the publisher that his run of books and the public taste are getting out of tune. So publishers of every grade have no sinecure profusions. It is merit and activity that acquire position, and the same are necessary to maintain it. Mr. Putnam, of New York, made a calculation some years ago (and the ratio can't be greatly changed now) that not much more than one in a hundred acquired independence among the trade, and that an average book yielded less on the investment than any other kind of merchandise. It is the few successful books that keep the wheels in oil. But they work some mischief beside. It binds the publisher to his idols, and it is not strange, but it leads them, on the strength of the initial work, to accept poorer work from the known than they would from the unknown. On the other hand, a great success in any line starts up a whole horde of imitation-mongers. Half furnished brains rush into literature as half furnished pockets do into lotteries, both confident in drawing prizes. There is no knowing how many sempstresses and school-ma'ams have rushed into print because of Mrs. Stowe's making a great hit; or because Gail Hamilton has touched for a while the public fancy, or Miss Prescott—we beg the lady's pardon, Mrs. Spofford—has tricked out acceptaoly some fanciful stories. The Editor's drawer of a certain monthly in this city would not need sifting half as often but for this class, who deluge him with their pot-hooks. The assurance of some is occasionally refreshing. Not long since a countryman whose reading had been confined to the Farmers' Almanac and the *Waverly Magazine*, had come to town to write for a living, and was always ready "to throw an article into their *Review* any time they wished it." It is of course possible that our stray rustic may yet become a Burns or a Hugh Miller; but the chances are decidedly against it. Gerald Massey began his literary career hardly more auspiciously, and he is now well assured enough in his position to escape a charge of effrontery in daring to solve for the hundredth time the mystery of Shakespeare's sonnets; but his admirers will be much more glad to learn that he is preparing for his publishers a new collection of his poems. More recent instances of untoward associations can be recalled in David Gray and Robert Buchanan—two poor Glasgow youths, almost penniless and friendless, who but only a few years ago made their way to London and to repute, and one has lived to see the poems of his friend and himself receive a Boston imprint, and to have his pen much sought for. Notwithstanding the London publishers of Buchanan's poems can cast their edition under so opportune circumstances as now prevail, upon the American market, Roberts Brothers have not, we fancy, reckoned blindly in issuing them in a single, collective volume, of handsome appearance.

Perhaps another instance of unexpected success we have in Jean Ingelow. It does much to convince us of a wide-spread sense of the poetic with the commonalty that her verse has wound its way to so many hearts. We should certainly have augured a rare repute for her among the finely-textured in brain, but hardly one among the class we speak of. It is only another instance of the great uncertainty of literary prognostications, and should teach us perhaps not to write what we now purpose. She still gives her admirers now and then a refreshing reminder of her sympathy. Occasionally a little poem appears in some one of the English magazines, unmistakable for its recurring emotion. Her first volume has been so successful (ten editions in London in two years and sixteen here) that she delays out of fear, almost, issuing a second. A friend tells us, who hears from her at Hastings, where she now lives, that she is pondering over a second volume, hushing its urgent calls for release with a "Not yet, be still!" Her portrait, as the plate just issued shows, gives us a womanly look of sense, and this hesitancy seems to confirm it. To make so bold a mark as she has done in her first venture only elicits a severe ordeal for a second essay. She cannot be unmindful of sundry instances, of late years, of failure to sustain a rank, acquired through the indulgence of the public, somewhat too hurriedly awarded. Festus Bailey had been wise never to have courted the muse a second time. Alexander Smith found out too late that his floating in the upper air could not bear the ballast of any more of his verses, and has wisely taken to prose. Miss Ingelow has certainly elicited praises in quarters where praise means something. There is lushness in her verse, and fragrance in her thoughts, carried perhaps to an extent that it would be dangerous to exceed, and possibly—for the caprices of the coy ministers of fame are proverbial—not altogether safe to maintain. If Miss Ingelow's present poetic susceptibilities are so ingrained as to become her unvarying nature, the continuance of her popularity must be contingent perhaps on their excellence, possibly on the listless breeze of the hour. Should her next volume be but the reflex of her first, it will undeniably pall; should it show she has grown, it can command a rare repute. Meanwhile, the public are waiting patiently, and she is brooding with almost Horatian constancy. We are informed by her friend that she is sensible of the risk, and conscientiously bent on being circumspect in the matter. Not dependent on her pen for a livelihood, she can afford to be leisurely. If she can make herself feel secure of the problem by another year she will publish. In the interim, she is supervising the illustrations for a holiday edition of her first volume—the designs being now in the hands of the Dalziels—which will be ready for publication here and in England by another autumn.

MONTAIGNE.

From the Reader.

THE fame of Montaigne is on the increase. In France there are men who make the old Gascon the study of their lives, who devote themselves to the elucidation of his writings, and who quarrel over the interpretation of one of his phrases with as much zest, if not with as much acrimony, as scholars among ourselves quarrel over the meaning of a passage of Shakespeare. Since the revival of letters, no foreign writer has exercised as much influence upon our own literature. The "Essays" have been translated into the language of all civilized nations, and edition after edition has been called for and exhausted in each. They have not in any country had for readers what is known as the general public, but have obtained only what Mr. Emerson calls a chosen circulation—namely, among courtiers, soldiers, princes, men of the world, and men of wit and generosity. There are signs, however, that the appreciation is extending. A short time ago, a "family" edition appeared in England, and the reception lately given to the *eloge* pronounced on their author by the younger Guizot upon the re-opening of the College of France, may be fairly taken as indication of an increasing interest manifested in the life and works of the great essayist in the country of his birth.

Montaigne was thirty-eight years old when, in 1571, tired of courts and public employments, but rich in twenty years' experience of the ways of men in court and camp, he retired to his chateau in Perigord. Neither by circumstances nor temperament, we suspect, was he fitted to make a great figure in the barbarous, cruel, and deceitful court he had abandoned; and now, without much regret at his absence from the game he had left, he sat down in quiet indifference to all things, to conclude the remainder of his life, already more than half past, in the agreeable and peaceful abode he had inherited from his ancestors. Here and now, with his wife and numerous retainers upon whom to vent his ill-humor when he should begin to pine for past pleasures, he really began to live. His powers of observation were of the highest order, and had been judiciously exercised. Hitherto he had been in school. The time for meditation had now come, and he felt desirous of ascertaining what progress he had made. To the question *Que scais-je?* he was continually asking himself, we have for answer the three books which form the famous "Essays."

Most of his biographers pretend to see Montaigne thinking in these "Essays." But can you believe them? He is not so ingenuous as they report. The work is full of thoughts on innumerable subjects, but can scarcely be said to possess one predominant thought. In painting himself the writer expounds his philosophy; but he is so whimsical and inconsistent that the difficulty of ascertaining his central idea is insuperable. What was written in one mood has all the appearance of sincerity, yet it is utterly different from what he sets down on the same subject in another. What he had seen clearly he could express boldly; but his digressions are so numerous, and occur so frequently, that he himself often forgets, or pretends to forget, the text from which he is preaching. When you begin a chapter you do not know what is coming. The "Essay on Lame People," for instance, is devoted to an attack on miracles. He exaggerates, is paradoxical, and despises the technicalities and accuracies of any learning. It would be possible to string together scores of his likes and dislikes, of his opinions on men and things, and of revelations concerning himself, without getting a very accurate portrait of the essayist himself. It is, therefore, useless to attempt the discovery of his leading doctrine. Indeed, we do not suppose he had any cut-and-dry opinion of morals or of man's destiny. He believed that sound philosophy insured sound health. "The most evident token and apparent sign of true wisdom," says he, "is a constant, unconstrained rejoicing." He could not, therefore, understand why one man should fashion his belief to the customary, or to what is suitable for another and not for himself. Let every man's philosophy be in harmony with his own nature, and then for him there will be unconstrained rejoicing. If he knows only by hearsay, let him confess it, and not profess what he does not understand. As for himself, he shows in all he says that he was influenced by some such consideration as this. Mrs. Grundy does not seem to have had any terrors for him. Kings and mountebanks are equally men, and one of his great pleasures was to teach those, who in his time regarded the recovered classical writers as something more excellent than their own contemporaries, that they had natural wants like themselves, and like them would have acted under any given circumstance of life. But Montaigne knew their value, and he knew also the best things that had been produced in his own time. He knew, moreover, how to use both. What he wanted he took without hesitation, and was never particular whence he procured the straw, so that it made good bricks. "If I wish to give an appearance of reading to this 'Essay on Physiognomy,'" says he, "I have only to stretch out my hand and take down a dozen books, consisting of extracts strung together. A single German preface would supply me with a store of learning." And he has certainly availed himself of the plan, for the reader will have difficulty in some of the essays, in discovering what is meant to be considered original, and what borrowed.

Towards the decline of his life—at a time of life, however, when with us statesmen and lawyers are considered young men—the little fellow, in several of his essays, and notably in that on some verses by Virgil, is solicitous to tell us that he is going to be naughty. He is careful to warn us of what is coming, and deprecates blame by giving us examples of others before him who have been as naughty as he intends to be. "Fallen into the extreme of severity, more peevish and more untoward," he purposely gave way to licentious allurements, and, now and then, permitted his mind to indulge "in wanton and youthful conceits," for the purpose of recreating itself. Hitherto, he wishes us to understand that he had defended himself from pleasure. Wisdom, however, has her excesses; so he wilfully turns his eyes aside from serious matters, and ceases for a time to contemplate the gloomy and tempestuous sky which constantly lowered before him. He amused himself and the reader with remembrances of his youthful days; and youthful tricks, long since forgotten, were brought up "to the session of sweet silent thought." "For my part," says he, "I am displeased with thoughts not to be published, and am resolved to dare speak whatsoever I dare do." We expect great things, but after all—and this is his great praise—he is not very naughty; he is only very coarse. If he is at fault, he is to be blamed, not for calling a spade a spade, but for making a spade the subject of his discourse. He does not excite the passions. He is writing about man as man, and will not abstract that which belongs to him as member of a Religious Tract Society from that which belongs to him in common with the other animals. He hates a wayward and sad disposition that glideth over the pleasures of his life and fastens and feeds on the miseries. He loved life and cultivated it, and regretted nothing that gave pleasure. He did not claim too high an origin. "We may mount upon stilts if we will, for on stilts we are still obliged to use our legs; and on the highest throne in the world we place what we place on the lowest stool. The finest lives, to my mind, are those which do agree with the common and human model—with order, without miracle, without extravagance." This is not contemptible philosophy.

Montaigne's personal confessions are as inaccurate as those of Goethe; but he has been so communicative and so explicit in speaking of himself, that we have little difficulty in figuring to ourselves the clumsy, thick-set, fidgetty little essayist, so short that he disliked walking because he got jostled by the crowd and lost in the mud, and so awkward with his hands that he could not cut a pen or fold a letter. He has the credit of being the frankest of all writers. But do you believe in the sincerity of his continual self-depreciation? When he takes you by the button, and, on tip-toe, gabbles away in a loud, shrill voice, and sometimes rather too long-windedly, about his inability to dance, or swim, or wrestle like other people, do you believe he is despising himself for this? When he confesses his ignorance of the value of the coinage, and of the difference between barley and oats, or tells you he could not understand why leaven is put into bread or how the apple gets into the dumpling, and therefore considers himself a lumber-headed old fool, do you take him at his word? Of all these things he was undoubtedly ignorant. But could not any of the retainers on his estate have enlightened him on these heads, and do you suppose Lord Michael de Montaigne, as Florio calls him, of the noble order of St. Michael, and one of the Gentlemen in Ordinary of the French King's Chamber, could feel satisfaction in knowing what was fitted only to be known by them? We think not.

Montaigne is the type of every man of culture at a certain stage of his development. He looked upon mankind, and chiefly upon himself, diversely; and the conclusion to which he came is the same as that to which others had come before. He thought all was vanity and vexation of spirit. Every one of us knows this; but most of us desire to forget it, or will not remember it. Montaigne does not hide this from himself. He never gives himself the air of one who is going to reveal secrets. You want to know what Is? He cannot satisfy you. You must go to others; he can, at the most, only tell you what is not. It is possible that all organization is tending to perfection; but he does not know it. He is not sure even of immortality, and carefully abstains from saying that he is. Indeed, with respect to this and other great problems that interest us, he had no view at all, and did not, we suspect, think it necessary to have one. Many before and since Montaigne's time have troubled themselves with these questions, and for certitude have experienced only doubts. Some there have been who eliminated these doubts by main force; or, without having them resolved, consented for their peace of mind to believe them insoluble, and thenceforward arrogantly assume that the opinions they have abandoned were unsound. But does it follow that he who changes sides necessarily goes from darkness to light? If change of opinion were in itself progress, the popularity and influence of such a writer as Montaigne would never be much. Before we can decide what is truth, we must have an undisputed criterion.

DEATH OF GREAT MEN.

From the Saturday Review.

THE death of the King of the Belgians adds another item to a year's list in which were already included the names of the two foremost men of two of the greatest nations of the world. Mr. Lincoln was assassinated at the moment when his presence seemed to be most essential in the councils of his country. Lord Palmerston died when his name represented to foreigners the soul of English politics. England, however, has moved on, so far, without any perceptible change. The United States have continued the perplexing work of reconstruction, under their new ruler, as well as they could have prospered under their old. And it is not certain that the loss of King Leopold will greatly alter the course of events in Europe, or perhaps even in Belgium. Three of the men who, at the beginning of the year, were the most prominent in the world, have dropped out, and the political machinery continues to work much as before. If we listen to the ordinary common-places, to say nothing of the formal compliments due to such events, we might have expected our whole system to be thrown out of gear. Whenever a prominent man falls, and still more when there is a prospect of his falling, we are told with every variety of emphasis that his importance cannot be over-estimated, that his loss will mark the commencement of a new era, and that a kind of moral earthquake will be propagated to the ends of the world. Somehow or other, the change is usually smaller than we expected, or professed to expect; we get up the next morning, and find that our breakfast tastes very much as it did the day before; and after a week or two the loss of the great man becomes an old story, and the new state of things is undistinguishable from the old. There is a very sensitive barometer by which the effect of any great event upon men's genuine opinions, as distinguished from their expressed sentiments, may be tested. It must be a remarkable death which produces any effect whatever upon the Funds. The men may be counted on the fingers whose loss would send the Three per Cents, down by one-eighth; and there is not more than one man, if there is one, whose loss would make them fall by a whole unit. If we measure a man's worth by the fluctuations of Consols, we should find that scarcely any man can be estimated at even the faint rumor of a war, to say nothing of a war itself. The subject is so far a trite one that moralists have often dilated upon the comparative insignificance of great men. But it may be worth while asking whether the cases we have mentioned are exceptional, or whether they are not rather instances of a rule which tends every day to become more generally true.

A certain school of writers has been very much attacked for maintaining that the progress of the world is very little affected by any individual, however conspicuous his position. The assertion is supposed to belong to the philosophy which considers human history to be developed by "inexorable laws," and not by the action of freewill. The metaphysical question thus raised is in reality quite irrelevant. The most positive of positive philosophers must admit that a man might produce an indefinite effect upon a society, if only the society was small enough. If England were inhabited by a hundred families, instead of twenty millions of people, we might be all dependent upon one man. The loss of a single battle might ensure our complete extirpation, and such a very minute army would probably be dependent upon its leader. On the other hand, every one must admit that there are some limits to the influence of the most powerful of men. Louis Napoleon, with all his horses and all his men, could not materially change the religion of his subjects, nor teach them all to write, nor even alter to any vital degree their laws of property and succession. There are limits to the power of every man; the question of what those limits are is simply one of degree, to be decided by experience. The question of freewill and necessity has no more to do with it than it has to do with settling whether a man can walk a thousand miles in a thousand hours. The extent of the influence of a man upon his fellows is a problem of social dynamics, upon the solution of which, as upon the solution of most other practical problems, metaphysical disputes have little or no bearing. It is, however, true that as men have come to look into history more closely, and to criticize it more scientifically, there has been a tendency to diminish the value attached to individuals. It was inevitable that it should be so, from the way in which history was formerly written. Every great event was labelled with the name of the man who happened to be uppermost, because it is always convenient to assume that the ringleader of a mob is the sole cause of its existence; it saves all the trouble of investigating deeper causes, and gives a summary and universal explanation. On the same principles, every change was supposed to be far more abrupt than it really was, till the transitory intermediate phases which had led up to it had been thoroughly examined. Thus, for example, it was first assumed that the French Revolution was a sharp line of division between two totally different periods, till people took the trouble to discover that many of the changes attributed to it, such as the subdivision of landed property, had existed to a great extent before the outbreak. It was next assumed that the French Revolution was entirely due to Robespierre, or Danton, or Mirabeau, or some one of its most conspicuous leaders; whence followed, logically, the conclusion that there would have been no revolution if there had been no Robespierre; and if Robespierre was originally irritated by an aristocrat splashing his stockings, we might say that if Robespierre's stockings had not been splashed there would have been no peasant proprietors in France. The disasters of the nobility, at the end of the fifteenth century, says Michelet, caused land to pass into the hands of the people; this happy event was called, in the monarchical stage, the good King Louis XI. The religious wars caused a similar result, a century later; this time the era, christened by another royal name, was called the good King Henry IV. This opinion, doubtless accepted in good faith, has found its latest exposition in the theory of providential saviours of a people, as explained in the preface to the *Life of Cæsar*.

The doctrine that the great bulk of the human race is a passive bulk of clay, which is patted and poked into shape at rare intervals by a series of heaven-sent moulders, had the merit of being picturesque. But it has already fallen into discredit in some departments of thought. A great scientific discoverer is no longer a man who tells us a secret which, without him, we should never have known; he is one who is a year, or perhaps a month, in advance of his neighbors. When a man invents something new, it always appears that some one else had invented it independently, though he had not published it so soon, and that half a dozen other men had been on the very verge of the discovery. The lucky originator has the pleasure of thinking that he has snapped it out of the mouths of a dozen hungry competitors, but he cannot flatter himself that his services were at all indispensable to the world at large. At least they have saved time. We are like travellers crossing an unexplored desert. It requires great qualities now for a man to precede his neighbors sufficiently to discover the sources of the rivers; in a short time it will become a common feat, and before many years there will be railroads running to take every one who chooses. There was a time when a man might, like Columbus, discover entirely new continents; but even Columbus would have been anticipated if he had waited a year or two longer. There would probably be as many people in America at the present moment if Columbus had been lost in his first voyage; and if Newton had never lived, we should probably know nearly as much about the solar system as we do, or at least we should have but little leeway to make up. This truth, which would be generally acknowledged in scientific matters, does not meet with equal acceptance in the domain of politics. Such a man as Louis Napoleon or as Count Cavour, upon whom the limits of empires seem to depend, certainly appears to occupy a much more important position. So do great generals. If this or that or the other battle had had a different result, as historians are so fond of saying, the fate of the world would have been different. If Charles Martel had not beaten the Moors, we should all have been Mahommedans; if William had lost the battle of Hastings, we should have been beer-swilling Anglo-Saxons instead of Englishmen; if Napoleon had not been defeated at Leipsic, we should all have been subjects of the French Empire. It is quite true that, if something had happened which did not happen, a result would have followed of which nobody can trace the consequences. But, whatever may have been the case formerly, it is evident that these possibilities are becoming gradually confined within narrower limits. The extent to which any man can can move the world is diminishing, because, somehow or other, the *vis inertiæ* of the world has increased. There was perhaps a time when the fate of a war depended a good deal upon the personal prowess of Achilles or the ability of Alexander. Now we can prophesy with tolerable certainty that the richest and most numerous people will get the best of it. The end of a contest is generally pretty clear from the beginning, if we know the forces that are to be employed. The Danes might be as brave as they chose, but, in the absence of intervention, they were certain to lose Schleswig-Holstein, because one man now-a-days is always, in the long run, beaten by two. If it could have been foreseen that North and South would fight it out to the end, there could have been no doubt which would be crushed, because it was plain which had the overwhelming superiority in numbers, wealth, and material. In other words, the victory does not now depend upon any particular man, but upon general conditions which it is possible to calculate beforehand. A General Lee may delay, but he cannot finally avert, the inevitable effect of the strongest battalions and the longest purse.

The same causes which lead to this comparative insignificance of individuals in warfare seem to operate in political affairs generally. The masses of mankind have been so systematically organized that their weight must tell. It tells as much upon their leaders as upon their adversaries. The most absolute of monarchs cannot act without constant reference to the will of his subjects; he is, to some extent, confined by the completeness of the machinery at the head of which he is placed. He is compelled to set it working in the accustomed grooves. If he attempts to turn it off the rails of the regular track, he finds that it will not run. He cannot alter the conditions, any more than the commander of a civilized army can turn his men, at a word, into a horde of Tartars or Arabs. He has unlimited power, so long as he does just what is wanted. The Emperor of the French is absolute on condition of being always popular. So long as he carefully watches the general desire, or keeps just in advance of it, he can do what he chooses; but if he refused to be bound by the conditions of a Hobson's choice, he would soon find his power limited. He is fettered by the completeness of his own authority. And if one man will not accept the position of being apparently the master and really the servant, it is not difficult to find another who will. When the science of governing is reduced to registering popular edicts, it does not so much matter who is the registrar. And that is the position to which governors, whatever the external form of government may be, are being more and more reduced.

In one respect this may be melancholy. If any man cherishes the ambition of altering the whole future of the human race, or even of one nation, he will most likely be disappointed. He will find out that the human race is very obstinate and stiff-necked, and has a strong tendency to jog on steadily upon its own path as it chooses. But a moderate man may be satisfied with what is still within the reach of many—affecting the fate of thousands, or even millions. A general may still throw away or save thousands of lives; a governor may execute or pardon a very fair number of rebels; and a Chancellor of the Exchequer may lower or raise the price of the tea of a million of families. No one must be disappointed if, notwithstanding this liberty of action, there is an enormously preponderating number of things which will settle themselves without reference to him. And it is no small satisfaction to the mass of mankind to think that their happiness and progress depend upon something more certain than the chance of finding a great man to secure it for them. There is some pleasure in the thought that nearly everybody would continue, after a time, to get richer and wiser and better, without much interruption, even if some new Guy Fawkes were to succeed in blazing up the Houses of Lords and Commons next Session—lamentable as such an event would be.

AN ILLINOIS LAWYER "DOING WELL."—There were few abler lawyers in the State of Illinois during the past quarter of a century than the late Judge Purple, of Peoria. He was the author of several important law books. By his entire devotion to his profession, he had attained merited celebrity as an advocate and jurist.

Some years since Judge P., when in the city of Washington, met with a gentleman from Boston, who, upon learning that the Judge was from Illinois, made particular inquiry as to the success of a young sprig of the law by the name of B——, who had emigrated West some five years before.

"He is doing very well," very promptly replied the Judge.

"He is? Well, I am glad to hear it—glad to hear it, indeed."

"You think he has a good practice, do you, Judge?"

"Don't know anything about his practice," replied Purple; "but he is doing well—succeeding finely."

"Making money, then, is he?" persisted Boston.

"I tell you I don't know anything about his business," said Purple.

"Well," said the Boston man, "you seem to think he is doing well, and yet you know nothing about his practice or business. What do you mean?"

"I mean this," said Purple, "that any man who practices law in Illinois five years, and who keeps out of the Penitentiary, is doing well, whether he has practice or not!"

DEAN ALFORD AS A POET.

From the Westminster Review.

THE poetry this quarter is rather less in quantity, and worse in quality, than usual. Dean Alford warbles for us in a volume* made up of that kind which, as Horace long ago said, is tolerated by neither gods nor men, but apparently only by women. His is the perfect type of the poetry of the commonplace. We know the sort well. It is religious in the spirit, but very prosy in the letter. It generally contains an "Ode to a Baby lately born," and another to one lately dead, and a note on the author's grandmother. *Bradshaw*, on the whole, is more poetical, and decidedly more useful.

Dean Alford, however, has his mission. Read him, and then you know, once for all, what all those little thin purple, blue, and green octavos of "Lyrics of the Heart," and "Leaves of my Childhood," are about. His book is a compendium of them all. It is the *Gradus* of platitudes, and the *florilegium* of faded metaphors. It contains alike the sighs of love-lorn curates, and the gushings of spinsters. He is Bavius and Mævia combined. "Midnight Thoughts," "On the Birth of my First Child," "To a Moonbeam by our Fireside," are the subjects which his Muse loves to adorn.

Evidently Wordsworth has been Dean Alford's model. And the Dean's verses have all the simplicity of his great master, without any of his thought. They are in places quite pre-Raphaelite. Thus the lines, "A few Hours after the Birth of my First Child," are in the first part so scientifically realistic, so lovingly filled in with the minutest details of midwifery, that they might have been written by an accoucheur. They are partly a commentary on the hardships of childbirth, and partly the service for the churching of women in blank verse. But gradually, the philosopher, the accoucheur, and the churchman disappear, the father prevails, and the conclusion does more than justice to the parental feelings. The Dean usurps the functions of the Prophet, and to "Welcome Little Stranger" adds some interesting prophecies.

The Dean's rhymes, too, are often pre-Raphaelite. Thus "east" pairs off with "blest" (p. 232); "search" matches to "torch" (p. 236), and increasing" makes a kind of Irish pre-Raphaelite rhyme with "chasing" (p. 263). We venture, however, to say that the Dean carries his pre-Raphaelitism a little too far, when he makes a child asks his mother on a fine spring day—

"Mamma, will the weather be as fine in heaven?"—p. 241.

This, we think, although a most natural question for an English child, smacks a little too much of our insular climate. To forecast heaven with a barometer is hardly what we should expect from a Dean. Again, we think the Dean should not call stars "lamping potentates" (p. 74), nor speak of "blosmy hawthorn" (p. 141), nor talk of "the river's silver swathes" (p. 217), as probably nobody will know what he means.

A local coloring, however, which is very pleasing, pervades some of his pieces. It is commonly supposed that one of the many duties of a Dean is hospitality, and the following stanza consequently seems to us very natural:

"The pretty lambs welcome their life,
In the fresh morning of the year;
Taking no forethought of the knife,
They play and do not fear."—p. 213.

We admire, too, the way in which the Dean deals with the great "nude" question. With equal delicacy and equal taste he clothes everything. With him the earth, even in the winter, generally considered the most naked time of the year, is "clad for her bridal glad" (p. 237), and the hills with him wear good thick "robes of purple and gold" (p. 100), and even the Morning is thoughtfully "kerchiefed in wind and rain" (p. 212), two elements whose only connection with clothes has hitherto been to spoil them. As for the spring—but the poet himself shall speak—

"Come, come, thou dallying Spring,
Over the hills that rise to the West,
Show us the gleam of thy sky-blue vest."—p. 238.

We can only parallel this with the beautiful expression of an American writer—

"Night drew her sable mantle around her, and pinned it with a star."

Further we need scarcely say that the Dean's volume contains, "Fragments of a Proposed Drama" (p. 152), and "Fragments of a Long-pondered Poem" (p. 305), "The End of a Charade" (p. 311), and "A Letter to a Friend" (p. 319). No little monograph of a rhymed silliness is ever complete without these; they are as sure to turn up as the "Portrait of a Gentleman" in the Academy, or a grey horse in a lady's novel.

One peculiarity there is, however, about the Dean's book—that he takes the public into his confidence about his future state. Generally speaking, Bavius and Mævia only confide to us their present joys and sorrows. From various passages in his book the Alford family would seem likely to enjoy that position which was denied the sons of Zebedee. The Dean, too, is not ashamed to describe his own personal apotheosis—

"When I am spirit clear,
More pure than is the ocean-moon."—p. 214.

For all this sort of thing we are of course prepared in tombstone poetry, when it is written by the parish clerk or the churchwarden. But we do think that good feeling and good taste should prevent a dignitary of the Church of England from publicly exalting himself, his family, and his personal friends to that Kingdom of Glory where, if he believes the Book which he so often unconsciously makes ridiculous, many are called, but few chosen; in which a special clause, too, is directed against the rich, amongst whom Deans, we suppose, may be classed.

* "The Poetical Works of Henry Alford, Dean of Canterbury." Fourth Edition, containing many New Pieces now first collected. London: Alexander Strahan. 1865.

COWPER'S GRANDFATHER.—Spencer Cowper, grandfather of the poet, had a most remarkable history, a portion of which is not generally known. After his marriage, and while he was fast rising as an eminent barrister, a young woman, a member of an opulent Quaker family, fell desperately in love with him. He took no advantage of her unhappy state of mind, and did his best to avoid her; but having been intrusted with some money due her on a mortgage, he called on her to pay it over late one evening. She pressed him to be a guest of the family, but he excused himself and retired. The next day she was found dead among the stakes at a mill-dam. As Cowper had been last seen in her company, and in the course of the evening had made use of some wild words in relation to the pretty Quakeress, he was arrested and tried for murder. There was absolutely no evidence against him; but the Quakers and tories joined in a formidable clamor, and the prosecution was conducted with a malignity and unfairness, in these days almost incredible, and a very dull and ignorant judge was on the bench. Cowper defended himself, and his brother, William Cowper, an eminent member of Parliament, sat by his side. The case against the prisoner rested chiefly on the vulgar error that a human body found, as this poor girl's body had been found, floating in water, must have been thrown into water while alive. To prove this, medical witnesses were called and also some sailors. But on the other side there was an array of men of science, among them Mr. Cowper, the most celebrated anatomist of England and the teacher of Cheselder, who taught John Hunter. Samuel Garth, a famous physician, was also a witness. "What do you say to the testimony of the sailors?" asked the stupid judge. "My lord," was the reply, "I say they are mistaken. I will find reason in abundance to swear that they have known whistling raise the wind." Cowper was acquitted, but the Quakers never forgot him, and it was many years before the clamor subsided. He finally became a judge, amid general applause, and distinguished himself "by the humanity which he never failed to show to unhappy men who stood, as he once stood, at the bar." All this happened near the first of the last century.

OPENING PARLIAMENT.—The Queen gave an intimation, when she promised to open Parliament, that there would be some little difference in the ceremonial,—and it appears that this difference is to consist in her not wearing the State robes, not riding in the State carriage, and not reading the Speech herself, which is to be read for her by the Chancellor. The character of Hamlet is not to be omitted owing to the actor's absence, for the actor will be present—among the audience. The most curious part of the arrangement is, however, that though the Queen won't wear the State robes, Parliament is not to be cheated of a refreshing glimpse of them, for they are "to be laid upon the throne,"—not, we suppose, fully displayed on a dummy, but folded up, just as papers are ordered "to lie on the table." Is there any precedent for this curious ceremonial?—if so, we should be sorry to object to anything time-honored. But if there is not, and the idea is to give us all the raw materials of a pageant, but not to manufacture them, the nation would probably prefer that the robes should be left at home altogether. There is but a dismal gratification in saying that on the 1st of February we were within an ace of a great pageant—that if certain different mechanical dispositions of clothes actually present on the occasion had been made there *would* have been one. Has the Queen been reading *Sartor Resartus*, and determined to give the nation a practical lesson out of it on the ironical philosophy of clothes?

THE NEW KING OF THE BELGIANS.

THE Duke of Brabant is a young man of virtuous habits, fond of mechanical invention and church music, a believer in relics, etiquette, and decency. The Parti Prêtre exult aloud at having at length a King in Belgium who, instead of being a believer in the cosmopolitan creed of Christendom, has a Jesuit for his confessor, and who lives in the light of the past. Leopold was too wise a man to worry his son on points of doctrine about which he himself cared nothing; but he would never allow him, while he lived, any opportunity of betraying his unpopular predilections by taking part in public affairs. "The Belgic throne is not a bad seat as times go," he used to say; "but it is neither old nor strong enough to afford being played tricks with. I wish to leave it to my son in a sound condition, and let him keep it so if he can." But the necessary consequence of this exclusion of the heir-apparent from public business is that he now comes to the performance of its duties utterly destitute of training or experience. He has allowed expectations to be formed by the priests and nobles of the Catholic party which he can never realize. They are full of dreams of legislative reaction like those which inflamed the evil councillors of Charles X, and prepared the way to his fall; and if the young King has the folly to dismiss his father's tolerant and prudent ministers, and to attempt the formation of a Roman cabinet, as there is reason to fear, the consequences to himself and his family may be serious. His young Queen is a woman of spirit and vivacity, against whom, notwithstanding her Austrian extraction, there has never been a murmur of popular distrust. But, hitherto, she has devoted herself altogether to the domestic care of her children; and Belgian society, which has always emulated the tone of that of France, has often peevishly complained that the Princess has never been heard of except in the nursery.

If covetous neighbors entertain, as they are suspected of doing, any design of partition or annexation, they will await, of course, the development of internal distractions in Belgium. The liberal party possesses great preponderant weight of intelligence, enterprise, and opulence in the great towns. Their antagonists have, no doubt, the majority of the peasant proprietors in their hands, and they comprise many wealthy and respectable persons among the nobility. But in a struggle for ascendancy, either in the Council, the Legislature, or the press, they could not hold their own for ten days together. This is so well understood on all hands that whatever misgivings are entertained of the stability of the present order of things, they point to intrigue and manœuvre, and in this direction nothing but experience to the contrary will be able to prove that there is not danger.—*Manchester Guardian.*

A REMINISCENCE OF PRUDHON.

A FRENCH letter-writer says: "I mentioned the celebration of the Empress' *fête* at Compiégne on the 15th of last month, and the numerous bouquets of exotic flowers with which her Majesty's guests presented her. M. de Nieuwerkerque, it appears, was fortunate enough to have been able to offer a treasure of no slight artistic value, it being one of the few water-color drawings extant by Prudhon, not only bearing his signature, but being a portrait of himself in the costume he wore at a ball given by the First Consul. The story of the discovery of this *trouvaille* is curious. M. Luquet, a well-known *connoisseur*, was wandering a few weeks ago along the remote Rue Mouffetard, when suddenly his attention was arrested by a drawing lying among some old fashions in the window of a barber's shop, the name 'Prudhon' being daubed in red letters at the corner of the sketch. We all know how scarce an authentic Prudhon has become of late years.

"Assuming a tone of indifference, M. Luquet inquired whether *cette image* (a term for a child's penny print) was for sale. 'No,' replied he of the razor